

Post-Graduate and Research Department Series No. 44

KĀÑCĪ KĀMAKOTĪ MUTT: A MYTH OR REALITY?

By

DR. W. R. ANTARKAR

**Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Pune 411 004 (India)**

2001

DR. W. R. ANTARKAR

KĀNCĪ KĀMAKOṬĪ MUTT ; A MYTH OR REALITY



Published by

M. G. Dhadphale, Honorary Secretary,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
Pune 411 004 (India)

Printed by

The Bhandarkar Institute Press, Pune.

*Reverentially
Dedicated
to
the Loving Memory
of my Parents.*

— W. R. Antarkar

॥ श्रीः ॥



जगद्गुरु-
श्रीमदाद्यशङ्कराचार्याः ।

FOREWORD

It gives me great pleasure in placing in the hands of Sanskrit scholars this research-book aiming to prove that the *Kāñci kāmakoṭi Mutt* in the southern part of India was established by no one else than by the Great Advaitin Ādi Śaṅkarācārya and that he himself was the first Head of the Mutt. So far it was believed that, for the propagation of his Absolute Non-dualistic Doctrine, the Great Philosopher of India established only four Mutt-s at the four quarters of India. The number was restricted to four as there are only four Veda-s and four Mahāvākya-s pertaining to the Vedānta doctrine. The author of the book after his rigorous studies extending over many years is convinced that the fifth Mutt of *Kāñci-kāmakoṭi* was also established by Śaṅkara and was meant as a centre of study of all the four Veda-s and of all the four Mahāvākya-s. He also believes that Śaṅkara breathed his last not in the Himalayan region but in South India. He has given his own arguments and has adduced impressive evidence to prove his thesis. In the orthodox circles, however, the book is bound to cause a great stir as its subject matter is moot and highly controversial. The authorities of the Institute after due deliberation decided to publish the book mainly for two reasons : (i) There being no finality in the field of researches, there should always be a due and fair appreciation of a fresh outlook; and (ii) our author Dr. W. R. Antarkar has as far as possible tried to be objective and impartial in dealing with a historical issue which is sensitive and perhaps contentious. The views expressed in the book are entirely his own and do not in any way reflect the views of the Institute.

This does not mean, however, that any apology is needed for the publication of the book. W. R. Antarkar was associated with the Institute as a Ph. D. student from 1955 to 1960 and carried out his work “Śaṅkara-Vijaya-s : A Comparative and Critical Study” under the mature guidance of the late Prof. R. D. Karmarkar. The *Kāñci-kāmakoṭi* issue formed only a part of his thesis. Dr. Rajgopal Sharma has written a book entitled *Kāñci-kāmakoṭi Mutt : A Myth*. This inspired Dr. Antarkar to write the present critical book under the title *Kāñci-kāmakoṭi Mutt : A Myth or Reality ?*

Dr. Antarkar himself admits that he has not said the last word on the subject. I shall, therefore, conclude with the following verse of Hemacandra with a modification in the second line ;

*Pramāṇa-siddhānta-viruddham atra
yad bhāṣitam granthakṛtā svamatyā /
Mātsaryam utsārya tad ārya-cittāḥ
prasādam ādhāya viśodhayantu ||*

“ May the noble-minded scholars, without cherishing ill-will, kindly search into the pros and cons of whatever according to his thought is stated here by the writer that goes according to them (scholars) against the valid means of knowledge and finally established facts ”.

Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Pune,
June 16, 2001

}

M. G. DHADPHALE

INTRODUCTION

It is with mixed feelings of joy, hesitation and some apprehension also that I am presenting this book to the public, particularly to scholars, who are specially interested in the biography of Śrī Ādi Śaṅkarācārya. His biography, available today in about 18 works, which can be compositely called *Śaṅkara-Vijayas*, contains a number of controversial issues, one of them being whether or not he established a (5th) Mutt at Kāñcī, in addition to the generally accepted 4 mutts at Dwārakā, Himālayas, Jagannāthapurī and Śrīrgerī on the bank of the Tuṅgā river. This book attempts to discuss this issue at length and in details. Scholars are divided on this issue, some holding that he did and many holding that he did not establish such a mutt at Kāñcī. After going through all the material and arguments on both the sides as far as I could get, utilise and understand them, I have come to the conclusion that Śaṅkara must have established a 5th Mutt at Kāñcī, though not necessarily an Āmnāya Mutt, as every one of the other 4 mutts is said or claimed to be and that Śaṅkara himself must have occupied it as its first head. I do not claim to have said the last word on the subject and how far my appraisal and/or evaluation of the evidence and the arguments on both the sides is satisfactory and/or convincing, it is for the readers and scholars to decide. My only submission is that I have been as impartial and objective as well as thorough as I could be in presenting the whole subject. Readers are requested to read the book in the non-partisan spirit, in which I have tried to handle its subject matter.

Acknowledgments :

Firstly, I am extremely thankful and grateful to the very prestigious Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Pune, for undertaking the work of printing and publishing this small book of mine. They have done the job nicely and painstakingly, inspite of the many drawbacks they came across in original hand-written manuscript. I am particularly obliged for the same to the BORI Press staff, and especially to Shri A. N. Gokhale who has read the proofs quite meticulously. In the process, however, he has made many alterations in the text of my original writing without my knowledge or consent, to which, of course, I do not subscribe.

Secondly, I am equally thankful to Dr. M. G. Dhaphale, Hon. Sec., B. O. R. I., for taking a personal interest in getting the book printed expeditiously, inspite of a number of difficulties they have been facing even today.

Thirdly, research of a historical type in particular and that too connected with somewhat old and even ancient history, is hardly possible without the help and cooperation of a number of persons and even Libraries, particularly in the South, to whom I am extremely grateful. It is not possible to name them all nor would they like me to do so or misunderstand me if I do not. All the same, I am very greatly thankful to them all for the same.

I now leave it to scholars to decide about the results of my research, reached and presented by me in this book.

B-5 Jayaram Niwas,
116 Tilak Mandir Road,
Vile Parle (East), Mumbai 4000 57



W. R. Antarkar

ABBREVIATIONS

[*N. B.* Abbreviations have been given under six different heads / groups. Within these groups, they have been arranged alphabetically.]

(I) Names of Persons :

- Abhi. Śaṅ. — Abhinava Śaṅkara
A. S. / Anant. Saras. — Anantānendra Saraswatī
Ātma. — Ātmabodha
Bādarā. — Bādarāyaṇa
Bhag.rya — Bhagavatpādācārya
Dakṣiṇā. — Dakṣiṇāmūrti
Gauḍa. — Gauḍapāda
Gov. Muni — Govinda Muni
Gopī. — (T. G.) Gopīnātha (Rao)
Hastā. — Hastāmalaka
Jivā. Vidyā. — Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara
Kumā. — Kumārila
Madhvā. — Madhvācārya
Mahā. — Mahāvīra
Maṇ. — Maṇḍana (Miśra)
Nārā. — Nārāyaṇa
Padma. — Padmapāda
Prabhā. — Prabhākara
Pṛthvī. — Pṛthvidhara/^odhava
Rāmā. — Rāmānuja
Sanan. — Sanandana
Śaṅ. — Śaṅkara
Śaṅ.ya — Śaṅkarācārya
Śaṅ.ite — Śaṅkarite
Śaṅ. Nārā. — Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa
Saras. — Saraswatī

Sarva. — Sarvajñātman
 Śiva. — Śivaguru
 Sure. — Sureśvara
 Sūrya. — (B.) Sūryanārāyaṇa (Rao)
 Venkaṭa. — (K. R.) Venkaṭarāman
 Vidyā. — Vidyāranya (Muni)
 Viśva. — Viśvarūpa

(II) Names of Ācāryas (Pīṭhādhipatis)

Abhi. Nṛ. Bhā. — Abhinava Nṛsimha Bhāratī
 Bhā. Kṛ. Tī. — Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha
 Candra. Bhā. — Candraśekhara Bhāratī
 Candra. Saras. — Candraśekharendra Saraswatī
 Girijā Tī. — Girijā Tīrtha
 Mahā. Saras. — Mahādeva Saraswatī
 Nara. / Nr. Bhā. — Narasimha/Nṛsimha Bhāratī
 Rāma. Bhā. — Rāmacandra Bhāratī
 Saccidā. — Saccidānanda
 Sadā. Saras. — Sadāśiva Saraswatī
 Śaṅ. Bhā. — Śaṅkara Bhāratī
 Nitya. — Nityabodhaghanācārya

(III) Names of the authors of Śaṅkara Vijayas

Ānanda. — Ānandagiri/Ānandajñāna
 Bāla G. — Bāla Gopāla (yati)
 Br./Brah. Saras. — Brahmānanda Saraswatī
 Cid. — Cidvilāsa
 Cit. — Citsukha
 Gov. — Govindanātha
 Lakṣ. Śās. — Lakṣmaṇa Śāstri
 Lakṣ. Sūri. — Lakṣmaṇa Sūrin
 Mād. — Mādhava
 Nīla. — Nīlakaṇṭha
 Param. Kavi. — Parameśvara Kavikaṇṭhīrava

Puru. Bhā. — Puruṣottama Bhārati

Rāma. D. — Rāmabhadra Dīxit

Rāja. D. — Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīxit

Sadā. — Sadānanda

Tiru. D. — Tirumala Dīxit

Vall. — Vallīśahāya

Vyā. — Vyāsācala

(IV) Names of Works :

(a) Śaṅkara Vijayas :

Anantā.ya — Anantānandagiriya

Bh. Pāda. / Bhag. Abhyu / Bh. Dayam. — Bhagavatpādābhy-
udayam

Br. Ś. V. — Br̥hat Śaṅkara Vijaya

G. V. K. — Guru Vamśa Kāvya

K. Ś. V. — Keralīya Śaṅkara Vijaya

K. / Kūṣm. S. V. — Kuṣmāṇḍa Śaṅkara Vijaya

Mād.ya — Mādhaviya

Pr. Ś. V. — Prācīna Śaṅkara Vijaya

Ś. / Śaṅ. Ca. — Śaṅkarācārya Caritam (of Govindanātha)

Śaṅ. Daya — Śaṅkarābhyudaya

Ś. D. Sāra — Śaṅkara Digvijaya Sāra

Śaṅ. Mahimā — Śaṅkarācārya Mahimā

Ś. M. S. — Śaṅkara Mandāra Saurabha

S. Ś. Jaya — Saṅkṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya

Ś. V. — Śaṅkara Vijaya

Ś. V. V. — Śaṅkara Vijaya Vilāsa

Śaṅ. Vilāsa — Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa

Vyā.ya — Vyāsācalīya

(b) Other Works :

Br. Up. Dīpikā — Br̥hadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Dīpikā

BSBh. — Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya

Epl. Karna. — Epigraphica Karnatika (Vol. VI)

GBh. — Gītā Bhāṣya

" Greatness " — Greatness of Śrīgerī by R. K. Iyer

G. R. M. — Guru-Ratna Mālā/Mālikā

J. Ś. M. V. — Jagadguru Śaṅkara Maṭha Vimarśa by R. G. Śarmā
Judi. Refr.s etc. — Some Judicial References and some administrative records regarding Śaṅkarācārya Mutts by N. K. Reddiar

Kāma. Śata. — Kāmakoṭī Śatakoṭī by M. V. Śāstry

काशी में कुम्भकोण० — काशी में कुम्भकोणमठविषयक विवाद by R. G. Śarmā
Mārka Purāṇa. / Sam. — Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa / Samhitā

Maṭhā. — Maṭhāmnāya

" Myth " — Kāñci Kāmakoṭī Maṭh — A Myth by R. G. Śarmā

P. Ś. M. — Puṇya Śloka Mañjarī

P. Ś. M. Pari. — Puṇya Śloka Mañjarī Pariśiṣṭa

Satyā. — Satyānveṣaṇa by R. G. Śarmā

Siddh. Pa. (सि० प०) — Siddhānta Patrikā

Ś. Rah. — Śiva Rahasya

Ś. M. T. P. — Śaṅkara Maṭha Tattva Prakāśikārtha Saṅgraha by
K. V. Pantalu

Ś. M. T. S. — Śaṅkara Maṭha Tattva Prakāśikārtha Saṅgraha by
K. V. Pantalu

Śrī Ādya Śaṅ. ya etc. — Śrī Ādya Śaṅkarācārya — His Maths and
Memorials by M. S. Dave

Śrī Śaṅ. ya and the Mutts etc. — Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and the Mutts
established by him by K. Nilakaṇṭhan

Śrī Śaṅ. ya & Śaṅ. ite etc. — Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarite Institu-
tions — Anantānendra Saraswatī

" Throne " — The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom by K. R.
Venkaṭarāman

The traditional age etc. — The traditional age of Śrī Śaṅkarā-
cārya and the Maths by Aiyer & Śāstri

" Truth " — The truth about the Kumbakoṇam Mutt by R. K.
Iyer (Pt. I) and by K. R. Venkaṭarāman (Pt. II)

(V) Nam: of Places

- Cidam. — Cidambaram
 J. Purī — Jagannātha Purī
 K. K. Mutt — Kāñcī Kāmakoṭi Mutt
 K. Mutt — Kāñcī Mutt
 K. Śāradā M. — Kāñcī Śāradā Mutt
 Kūḍ. Śṛṇ. — Kūḍali Śṛṅgerī
 Kumba. — Kumbakonam
 Puṣpa. — Puṣpagiri (Mutt)
 Śiva/ŚGM — Śivagaṅgā (Mutt)
 Śṛṇ. — Śṛṅgerī
 T. Śṛṇ. — Tuṅga Śṛṅgerī (Mutt)
 Virū. — Virūpākṣa (Mutt)

(VI) Miscellaneous :

- Akhilā. (Devī) — Akhilāṇḍeśvarī Devī/Goddess
 Candra. Liṅga — Candramouliśvara Liṅga
 Banā. Vya. — Banāras Vyavasthā
 C. Pl. — Copper Plate (Inscriptions)
 Mahā. — Mahāvākya
 Parama. Pari. (परम० परि०) — Paramahansa Parivrājakācārya
 Taha. — Tahasildar
 Upa. Br. Mutt — Upaniṣad Brahmendra Mutt
 Upā. Pīṭha — Upāsanā Pīṭha
 Yoga. — Yogapattaka
 V. V. Press — Vāṇī Vilās Press (Śrīraṅgam)
 Vidyā. Mahā. (विद्या० महा०) — Vidyāraṇya Mahācājadhāṇī

KĀNCĪ KĀMAKOṬĪ MUTT A MYTH OR REALITY

I have stated in my thesis the two positions regarding the fifth Mutt, viz. Kāñcī Kāma. Mutt a/s Kumbakonam Mutt – its reality or otherwise – along with my own opinion in the matter. As, however, many new books have come out on both sides after my thesis was prepared and submitted to the University of Poona in 1960, it is necessary to state the position again and my assessment of the same, as far as the new books became available to me.

At the outset, I would like to say, for whatever it may be worth, that I am neither for nor against either of the two parties and as such, I am not interested to prove or disprove either. I am also not interested to support or refute each and every statement made or argument put forward on the two sides. If I appear to favour one of the two points of view, it is sheer on account of the weight of evidence, as far as I could gather, understand and assess it. No other consideration has swayed or influenced my thinking. In fact, I have been trying all these years to get at the basic texts involved in the case, so as to be able to clinch the issue and to put a stop to all this business which, to me at least, looks very unseemly. My attempt has all along been to find out whether or not Śaṅ. founded at Kāñcī a separate Mutt, Āmnāya or otherwise, where presumably he became the first head (Pīṭhādhipati) and where he possibly stayed during the last days of his life.¹ My principal source and basis has been the *Śaṅkara-Vijaya*-s – 16 or 17 with me – to which my thesis pertains and which, in my opinion, are the real (written) source of whatever we know today about Śrī Ādi Śaṅ., barring some stray information we get from some Purāṇas like *Śiva*, *Matsya* and so on.

The two positions (The two positions in brief are) :

(1) According to the K. Mutt,² Śaṅ., after establishing the 4 Mutts (at Dwārakā, Kedāra, Purī and Śringerī), came to Kāñcī and among the

1. The place of Śaṅ.'s final disappearance or passing away has been discussed by me in my article on the subject in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, 1997 (Vol. 71 of 1996, pp. 1-22).
2. I shall use this expression hereafter generally to denote the Kāñcī Kāmakōṭī Mutt or the Kumba. Mutt, according as the supporter of the Kāñcī and Śrī. Mutt may like to have it. The expression K. Mutt, also used sometimes, denotes 'Kāñcī Mutt'.

other things he did there, he also established there a fifth Mutt, of which he became the first head (Adhipati), thereby starting a line of pontifical succession, which continues unbroken even to date. The succession is supposed to be contained in their works, *G. R. M.*, with the commentary *Suṣamā* and *P. Ś. M.* with its appendages.

In the 18th cent. A. D., political unrest in and about Kāñcī compelled the Mutt-head and its people to leave their head-quarters in Kāñcī and shift them first to Tanjore and then to Kumbakonam where they established a mutt as a continuation of the one at Kāñcī.¹

In the middle of the 19th cent. A. D., they came back to Kāñcī, where they are still there, though the location of the mutt has been somewhat shifting from one place to the other.²

The claim of the K. Mutt is said to be based on works, besides those mentioned above (*G. R. M.* etc.), like the *Ānandagiriya*, *Śiva-Rahasya*, *Mārka Purāṇa* and the various works like *Br. Ś. V.*, *Pr. Ś. V.*, *Śaṅ. Vilāsa*, *Gauḍa-pādollāsa* and others, cited as authorities in *Suṣamā* and lastly, on the (ten) Copper-plate-grants brought forward by the K. Mutt.

(2) According to the other side, headed by the Śringerī Mutt and supported by the Dwārakā- and Purī Mutts, the position is as follows :

Śaṅ. established 4 Āmnāya mutts only at Dwārakā, Kedāra, Purī and Śringerī³ and none at Kāñcī at all. What is now claimed as the Kāñcī Mutt is nothing but the Kumba. Mutt, started for the first time at Tanjore and later on, shifted to Kumba. about 1821 A. D. As such, there is no such thing as shifting of the K. Kāma. Mutt to Kumba for any reasons whatsoever. The Kumba. Mutt also is only a branch of the Śrī. Mutt and even the Kāñcī Śārādā Mutt referred to in the copper-plate-grants is at best a branch (A Cikkudiar Mutt) of the Śrī. Śārādā Mutt and no independent Mutt established by Śaṅ. The so-called Kāñcī Mutt is not older than the Upaniṣad Braharendra Mutt, which came into existence not more than 200 or 250 years ago at the most. Mr. K. Sunderamaih holds that for asserting its independence of the Śrī. Mutt, "a house seems to have been

1. There is some difference of opinion as to the exact year of the shifting of the Mutt from Kāñcī. to Kumba, for which vide (i) *The Mutts of Śrī. Śaṅ. : A legal review* by Śrī M. Swaminatha Iyer, pp. 14-18; (ii) *Mutt* pp. 19, 20 and 82, 83.

2. When I first visited the Mutt in 1957, it was in Viṣṇu Kāñcī near the Varadarāja Temple while it is now in Salai Street, Śiva Kāñcī. Prior to it, it was in Sannādhi street; also Śiva Kāñcī.

3. Vide *Śrī. Māhāmāyā Stotra Stt.* 4, 7, 11, 14; Pub. by Sri Vani Vilas Press, Śrīraṅgam.

newly built in Kāñci about 150 yards east of the Śrī. Śaṅ. Matam". Then he quotes approvingly Mr. Gopinath Rao to the effect that "it is only at a comparatively later period, that a new matha seems to have been erected in Śiva Kāñci and that the tradition of their removal at Tanjore is comparatively a recent one and consequently (not worth) believing". In a similar strain, he quotes MM. K. V. Pantalu, who 'seems to have stated there (i. e. in शांकरमठतत्त्वप्रकाशिका), in a condemnatory language, that the Kumba. Mutt bought a Śūdra House in Kāñci and newly built a Mutt there in the latter half of the 19th century (vide Śrī Śrī. Śāradā Mutt by K. Sunderamaih, 1958, p. 14 (2)). The so-called authorities put up by the K. Mutt have all been cooked up in different ways by the partisans of the mutt after the end of the 18th cent. A. D., when the K. Mutt started their propaganda, which was intensified by the Paramācārya (Sri Chandrashekharendra Saraswati) in the second quarter of this i. e. 20th cent. A. D.

The arguments in details of this Śrī. group are :

(1) Firstly, the establishment by Śaṅ. of an Āmnāya Mutt at Kāñci has not been specifically mentioned in any Ś. V. (biographies of Śaṅ.), Ānandagiriya (i. e. Ś. V. of Anantānandagiri a/s Ānandagiri) is the main support of the K. Mutt but except in what the Śrī. people describe as the 'embellished' edition of that work, there is no mention of such a Mutt. The 'embellished' edition is a concocted one and is not supported by a majority of the Mss. used for the same and as such, is not reliable. It is also unreliable on account of the subversive details of the names of Śaṅ.'s parents and birth-place as Sarvajit / Viśiṣṭa and Cidambaram as against Śivaguru / Āryāmbā and Kālaṭi / Kālaḍi given in all other works and also on account of references therein to Rāmānuja and Madhva, the two great philosophers.

Vyāsācala, the author of Śaṅ. Vijaya and referred to as Vyā. ya, is regarded by the K. Mutt. supporters, as one of the heads of their mutt but he also makes no mention of any mutt established by Śaṅ. at Kāñci.¹ Even the editor of Vyā. ya, not avowedly an opponent of the K. Mutt, remarks in his Introduction to the same that "it is surprising that Vyā. makes no reference to a Mutt, of the founder of which he is writing a biography".² When it was pointed out that Vyā. does not mention the other Mutts also as having been established by Śaṅ.,³ Mr. Sunil rejoined

1. Vide "Disputed Lineages" by Sri K. P. Sunil, Illus. Weekly, p. 13; 13.9.1987.
2. Vide "Supplement" between English Introduction and Sanskrit Introduction.
3. Vide "Authentic heritage" by Sri R. G. K., Illus. Weekly, p. 44, col. II(3), 27.11.87;

that this was of no consequence because Vyā. was the head of the K. Mutt as per its supporters and hence the non-mention by him of a Mutt at Kāñcī means either that he was not the head of that Mutt or that no Mutt was established by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī.¹ The first of the five additional stanzas said to exist in one Ms. of *Vyā.ya* obtained from the Kumba. Mutt contains a reference to a स्वकलुप्त मठ at Kāñcī but this is a concocted variant and not a part of the original text. The text as printed by the University of Madras also does not give this reading, its reading being ननन्द सभ्यः (in place of मठे स्वकलुप्ते).²

Guru-Paramparā of Kāñcī Mutt

P. Ś. M. by Sadā. Bodhendra with the appendices (*Parīṣiṣṭa* by Ātmabodha — Part I, and by Polgam Ramasastry — Part II) *G. R. M.* by Sarvajña Sadā. Brahmendra, *Suṣamā* — a commentary on *G. R. M.* by Ātmabodha, जगद्गुरुपरम्परास्तव by Sudarśanamahādevendra (stanzas 65-66 by Sri Jayendra Sarasvati, the present head of the K. Mutt), and जगद्गुरुपरम्परानाममाला by Mahādevendra Sarasvati a/s Sudarshan*, are said by the K. Mutt supporters to give the unbroken line of the heads of the K. Mutt from 509 B. C. onwards.

Mr. R. G. Sharma and Prof. Umesh have tried³ — the former at great length — to show that these works are altogether unreliable historically. Firstly, Mr. Sharma and Mr. R. K. Iyer have tried at length⁴ to prove that Sadā. Brahmendra could not have been the author of *G. R. M.*, at all. So also, *P. Ś. M.*, which is claimed to have been written in the first part of the 16th cent. A. D. (1523 A. D. to 1529 A. D.), being a collection of *pūṇya-śloka-s* composed by different persons at different times, with some new stanzas added to them later, cannot be accepted as such for the simple reason that the form in which this history of the K. Mutt over a period of 2000 years lay scattered has not been explained nor can it be ascertained. *G. R. M.* is said to be based on this *P. Ś. M.* As a matter of fact, all these works — *P. Ś. M.* with its appendages, *G. R. M.* and *Suṣamā* appear to have come out suddenly and simultaneously, all presumably prepared together in the 18th cent. A. D. to support the claim of the K. Mutt. Before that time, these authorities did not exist. The so-called Guru-Paramparā of the Mutt also is all concocted prior to the 18th cent. A. D. In fact, it is said to be

1. Vide "Much ado about nothing" by Sri K. P. Sunil, *Illus. Weekly*, p. 39, col. 1, 13-12-1987.

2. Vide *Truth* p. 68; *JSMV* p. 261 (middle).

3. Vide *JSMV* pp. 268-278; *Śaṅ.'s Date* by Prof. R. M. Umesh, pp. 131-155.

4. Vide *JSMV* pp. 268-278; *Truth* pp. 71-78; 78-110.

just a list of eminent men in different fields as the successive heads of the Kāmakoṭi-pīṭha. The only believable history of the K. Mutt extends over 200 years or so i. e. from its 61st Ācārya, Mahādeva Sarasvatī V, all the previous history being imaginary only.

Mr. R. K. Iyer examines the list of K. Mutt Ācāryas under two heads, earlier (upto Abhi. Śaṅ.) and later (from Ācārya No. 46 to Candra. Sarasvatī No. 66¹), while Mr. Sharma puts them into 4 groups—the first three from 509 B.C. to 1704 A.D. and the last one from 1704 A.D. and onwards to the present date.² Thereafter, both these critics have tried to analyse—Mr. Sharma more than Mr. Iyer—the particulars of the various Ācāryas from the beginning to the end of the 17th cent. A.D. in particular and finally concluded that there are internal discrepancies in their accounts as given in *P. Ś. M.*, *G. R. M.*, and *Suṣamā* and hence even though they are most of them well-known figures, they could not have been the Ācāryas of the K. Mutt which did not exist at all. Their timing in history also does not tally with that given in these works. Mr. Sharma's conclusions based on the biographical material available so far, are :³

(1) The Kumba. Mutt started at Tanjore in the 18th cent. A.D. It came to Kumbakoṇam proper in the earlier part of the 19th cent. A.D. They established a mutt there in 1821 A.D. with the help of King Sarfoji of Tanjore.

(2) This Kumba. Mutt established its connection with the Kāmākṣī temple in 1839 A.D. and acquired the trusteeship of the temple in 1842 A.D.

(3) This K. Mutt managed to perform the सारङ्गप्रतिष्ठा of Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī at Jambūkeśvaram in 1845 A.D.

(4) According to one पञ्चव/चरित्र on palm-leaf (*tāḍapatra*), one महादेवसरस्वती was sent from Śringerī but he stayed at Tanjore only and possibly, he was the first head of the K. Mutt in the 18th cent. A.D. (महा० सर० V, 1704 A.D. to 1746 A.D.). His place of passing away is said to be near Madras but there is no evidence for this.

(5) Govinda Dīkṣita was the minister of the Tanjore state. His descendant Venkaṭa Dīkṣita, was residing at Kumbakoṇam. He assumed the name चन्द्रशेखर सर० V, after Samnyāsa. Govinda Dīkṣita was very learned and influential. Through him, the K. Mutt people got the patronage of the

1. Vide *Truth* Ch. IX-X.

2. Vide *JSMV* pp. 372-375.

3. Vide *JSMV* p. 421.

Tanjore king and got their desires fulfilled. The heads of the K. Mutt from Nos. 64 to 68 come in the line of Venkata Dīkṣita.

(6) *Suṣamā* was written by Ātmabodha, an assumed name only,¹ during the reign of मद्रास व (1704-1746 A.D.). It is quite possible, however, that the name Ātmabodha is but the pseudonym of a Pandit, who has obliged the K. Mutt with the list of the heads.²

Mr. K. R. Venkataraman quotes Sri S. V. Viśvanāthan and Sri S. V. Venkaṭeśvara as questioning the authoritativeness of the earlier part of *G. R. M.* and the genuineness of the older verses therein.³ Both these persons are devoted admirers of the K. Mutt. According to Mr. K. R. Venkataraman, "an eagerness to place Śaṅ. several centuries before Christ has obviously led the chroniclers to the necessity of fabricating chronology.⁴ In fine, upto the end of the 18th cent. A. D., the list of the heads of the K. Mutt is purely imaginary, a creation of Ātmabodha's genius."⁵

Mr. R. G. Sharma has some other objections also to the K. Mutt list of Gurus, as follows :

(1) Many of the Kāñcī Mutt Ācāryas from 509 B. C. to 1704 A. D. are said by the K. Mutt to have stayed out of Kāñcī and wandered about in the north for about 1100 years, 12 Ācāryas in succession (Nos. 14-25) staying out for 276 years.⁶ Many Ācāryas have been referred to Kāśmīra. There are, however, many objections to this account :⁷

(i) Why did so many Ācāryas leave their head-quarters for centuries together and go elsewhere? Many well-known scholars like Dr. Altekar and Dr. Shivanath Sharma, the latter an expert on Kāśmīra History, when asked about this matter, have said that there is no reference to or mention of any Ācārya of Kāñcī mutt and there is no history of any exalted person of that Pīṭha or Upa-Pīṭha nor have the Ācāryas left any relics or Samādhis anywhere in the north. Everywhere, there is Śiva but no Kāñcī Mutt.

(ii) There is also no record as to who appointed the persons as the Ācāryas of the mutt, when and where, nor why they were wandering like this for such a long time. They had maintained no connection with

1. Vide *Truth* p. 78.

2. Vide *Truth* p. 110.

3-4. Vide *Truth* p. 195.

5. Vide *Truth* p. 110.

6. Vide *JSMV* p. 369.

7. These will be found in *JSMV* Pt. II, Ch. 4, pp. 368-426.

Kāñcī and passed away outside Kāñcī, without any Samādhi being built to them anywhere.

(iii) Many of these Ācāryas are said to have written books but none of these books contains any reference to the Kāñcī Mutt or to their being the heads of that Mutt. The names of the Vidyāguru-s mentioned in these books do not tally with the corresponding names given in the mutt's list of its various Ācāryas.

(iv) Similarly, many persons nearby Kāñcī wrote works during the intermediate period but there is no trace of the K. mutt or its Ācārya in any of them. It appears that the dwellers of South India were simply not aware of the K. Mutt.

(v) Then, again, Kāñcī Ācāryas are said to be residing in Kāñcī between the 2nd cent. A.D. and 6th cent. A.D. During this period, Buddhist religion was being propagated in and around Kāñcī. This period was the golden period of Buddhism in the South, when it was being propagated by male and female Buddhist monks. 16 Kāñcī Ācāryas were living in Kāñcī in the 6th/7th cent. A.D. During all this period, what was done by the Kāñcī Ācāryas to check or counteract the influence, propaganda and spread of Buddhism? The same argument applies to the Buddhist propaganda in the 13th and 14th cent. A.D., and then also, the K. Ācāryas did nothing to check the same. The reason and answer for all this is that there was no such thing as the K. Mutt at all. The decline of Buddhism was brought about by other factors.

(vi) Lastly, Madras Govt. records show that the K. mutt is quite recent and was not there from the time of Ādi Śaṅ. The Mutt Ācārya was called "a stranger to Kāñcī" in 1839 A.D.

Mr. Sharma's conclusion in the matter, therefore, is : From the 61st Ācārya, Mahā. Saras. V (of the Kāñcī Mutt list), Kumbakonam people started living in Tanjore. They had no connection with Kāñcī whatsoever. In Tanjore, they were honoured by the Tanjore king and the lineage of K. Mutt Ācāryas started there. This परम्परा (lineage) subsequently obtained some records from Kāñcī Śārādā Mutt and then, with the help of pseudo authorities and some other works, they desired to become the supreme mutt. It can, however, be shown by evidence that the Kāñcī Mutt was a branch or *tunḍu* mutt only and its Ācārya was only a Cikhudiar (Junior) Swami. With the help of the Tanjore King, it succeeded in preventing the heads of the other Mutts from going through the Tanjore District and this was made possible by the generous indifference of the Śringerī Swamiji's. The only

believable history of the K. Mutt extends from 1704 A. D. onwards only, all previous history being concocted and imaginary.

The Other Authorities

Suṣamā, the commentary on *G. R. M.* and ascribed to Ātmabodha, quotes profusely from many works, most of which are not available today. In the case of some other works, which are available today, stanzas have been quoted, which are, however, not found in those works.

(1) The most important of the works so quoted is *Br. Ś. V.*, ascribed to Cit. who is said to have been a co-student and contemporary of Śaṅ. This work has been described by Mr. Sharma as unknown and not available today (अज्ञान और अनुपलब्ध)¹ but ascribed to a known person, viz. Cit. According to Mr. Sharma, if it comes to light and its authorship were proved to be as claimed by the K. mutt, it will have to be accepted as reliable and that till then it is better to suspend our judgment and withhold our criticism.² On the basis of the reference to this work as श्रीमदानन्दज्ञानाख्यानानन्दगिरिविरचित, occurring in the commentary by Dhanapati Surin on S. Ś. Jaya of Mād. (XVI. 46), Mr. Sharma has coined a new name प्राचीनवृद्धचक्रवर्जित्य,³ which he ascribes to Citsukha, though he treats of Pr. Ś. V. of Ānandajñāna a/s Ānandagiri as the basis of Mād.'s S. Ś. Jaya.⁴

Suṣamā describes Cit. as one who served Śaṅ. every moment, who was with him till the end of his life, who was a witness to all the events (in Śaṅ.'s life) and was, as if like a full brother born in the same Agrahāra.⁵ Making use of this, Mr. R. K. Iyer remarks that this village-mate of Śaṅ. was evidently looking on calmly when Śaṅ. was in the grip of the crocodile and was appealing to his mother for permission to turn an ascetic (Sannyāsin).⁶

1. Vide *JSMV* p. 114.

2. Vide *JSMV* p. 145.

3. Vide *JSMV* p. 476.

4. Vide *JSMV* p. 186 (top).

5. Read : अनुक्षणमुपचरिताचार्यचरणाः आजीवमविरदयुजः सर्ववृत्तान्तसाक्षिणः सहजयदेकाग्रहारीत्यन्ताः श्रीसर्वज्ञचित्सुखाचार्याः । *Suṣamā* on *G. R. M.* St. 18, quoted in *JSMV* p. 146 and *Truth* p. 21. Surprisingly, Mr. T. S. N. Śāstri seems to identify this Cit. with Cit., the author of *Citsukhi* or *Tattva-pradīpikā* of the 17th cent. A. D. Vide *Age of Śaṅkara* p. 40, last sentence.

Mr. Sharma refers to the opinion of 'some scholars' (as usual not named or identified) that some writer of modern times wrote this work and published it in the name of Śrī Cit. The evidence for this opinion is, of course, not to be asked for.

6. Vide *Truth* p. 21.

Prof. Umesh, whom I met at Śringerī some years ago, told me that he had made a thorough search for *Br. Ś. V.* for three months but was not able to get it, but that he considered it 'spurious'. The second edition of *Age of Śaṅkara* by Mr. T. S. Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī, published by his son in 1971 A.D. contains the first chapter as from this *Br. Ś. V.* and it gives the astronomical details of the birth of Śaṅ. Prof. Umesh has found fault with the versification in that chapter as also with the details about Śaṅ.'s birth, which he got examined by a well-known astrologer, Mrs. Gayatrī Devī, who told him that the details did not tally astronomically. He also finds fault with Kuma. being a contemporary of Mahāvīra, which he considers untenable. Perhaps, these were his reasons for calling *Br. Ś. V.* 'spurious' even though he had not seen the whole work.

(2) *Śaṅkarendravilāsa*, ascribed to one Vākpāti Bhaṭṭa, is also often referred to and quoted from in *Suśamā*. The work is important for two reasons.

(a) *Suśamā* quotes as from ch. II of this work 29 stt., which give 788 A. D. as the year of birth of Śrī Abhinava Śaṅ., who is said to be the 38th head of the Kāñcī Mutt. The year of his passing away has been given therein as 840 A. D.

(b) Some incidents like the birth-particulars (birth-place and parentage), ascension of the Sarvajña Pīṭha and his passing away, pertaining to this Śaṅ., are said to have been grafted on to the life-account of Śrī Ādi Śaṅ. This work also has been described by Mr. Śarmā as unknown and not available (अनजान और अनुपलब्ध).¹ While discussing this work in details, he makes the same remark about its non-availability.² He also quotes the opinion of some scholars (he calls them अनुसन्धान विद्वान्) that there is no such work in existence.³ Even though Prof. Umesh discusses Abhi. Śaṅ. at length with reference to *G. R. M.* and *Suśamā*,³ he makes no reference to this work at all.

(3) Many other works quoted from in *Suśamā* to prove the establishment of the Kāñcī Mutt are also not available today. They are :

- (1) *Gauḍapādollāsa*
- (2) *Hari-miśriya*
- (3) *Mahā-puruṣa-vilāsa* by Bhavabhūti

1. Vide *JSMF* p. 114.

2. Vide *JSMF* p. 257.

3. Vide *Śaṅ.'s Date* Prof. Umesh, pp. 149-154.

- (4) Siddhavijaya Mahākāvya by Menṭha-Bhaṭṭa
 - (5) Two dramas Maniprabhā and Hayagrīva-vadha, ascribed to Rāmīla and Menṭhabhaṭṭa respectively
 - (6) Jagad-guru-kathā-saṅgraha
 - (7) Sadguru-santāna-parimala
 - (8) Vidyā-Śaṅkara Vijaya by Abhinavoddaṇḍa Vidyāranya Bhārati.
- (4) *Śiva-rahasya* has been said to be misquoted from ch. 16 of the 9th Aṁśa of the work, by omitting about 15/16 stt. from the said chapter. Even the portion quoted in *Suṣamā*, does not contain any reference to any mutt as having been established at Kāñcī.

(5) *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa / Samhitā* — Two chapters have been quoted by the K. Mutt people in their books in support of their claim. Paramācārya said that they formed part of the ब्रह्माण्डपुराण. This Purāṇa is said to have 100 स्कण्डs and the story of Śaṅ. is said to be given in the 7th & 8th Parispandas of the 72nd Khaṇḍa or in the 3rd Parispanda thereof. Firstly, this *Mārka. Sam.* is not to be found anywhere. The ब्रह्माण्डपुराण has not been fully published and whatever has been published, does not contain these two chapters, claimed to constitute the *M. Sam.* Mr. Śarmā says that the stanzas claimed by the K. Mutt to constitute this *M. Samhitā* are, with slight variations, the same as the stanzas sometimes attributed by them to the *Mārka-Purāṇa* but none of them are to be found in the 7 copies of the same collected by him from different sources.¹

(6) The two chapters of this *M. Sam.* mention the Śringerī and Kāñcī Mutt only, but none of the other three.

(7) Yogalīṅga is said to have been established by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī. He is said to have brought 5 līṅgas from Kailāsa or they were given to him by Lord Śiva at Kāśī. Out of these, he placed four līṅgas at the four known mutts and one at Cidambaram, with the result that none was left for Kāñcī.

If, again, a līṅga implies the establishment of a mutt, what about Cidambaram, where no mutt was ever established by Śaṅ.? Similarly, there is a चन्द्रसौलीशर-लिङ्ग at Dwārakā, Badari and J. puri but these are not counted among the five. Why?²

The योगलिङ्ग, said to have been established at Kāñcī, is said not to exist at any other place but it is referred to at प्रभासक्षेत्र (स्कन्दपुराण), Kāśī

1. Vide *JSMV* pp. 116-120.

2. Vide *JSMV* p. 119.

(विश्वेश्वरलिङ्ग - also called योगलिङ्ग) and on the border of Nepal and Kedāra-nātha.

This yoga-līṅga at Kāñcī is said to be supported by a passage from *Naiṣadha-Carita* of Harṣa (XII. 38), where the word योगेश्वर is said to support the claim of the Kāñcī Mutt. As a matter of fact, however, the correct reading there is योगेश्वर and not योगेश्वर and this rules out the claim of the Kāñcī Mutt supporters.

Then, again, the repetition of the word योग and the (lack of) distinction between मुक्तलिङ्ग and मोक्षलिङ्ग in the stanza तद्योगभोगवर &c. from *Śiva Rahasya* is not and has not been explained.

There is no reference to the līṅgas or to सौंदर्यलहरी, said to have been given to Śaṅ. by Lord Śiva in any *Śaṅ. Vijaya*, old or new.

Finally, even if we accept a योगलिङ्ग at Kāñcī, it does not prove the establishment of a Mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī.¹

Lastly, the style, diction and metre of the stanzas in the *Mark. Saṁ.* are quite modern / recent and the contents in part also are quite unbecoming, e. g. the Kāñcī Ācāryas are said to be deserving of worship by Indra, Brahmā and Viṣṇu also.

At the end, we come to works which have been quoted from in *Suṣamā* but though the works are available today, the passages quoted as from them are not found therein. The passages are :

(i) In its commentary on st. 20 of *G. R. M.*, *Suṣamā* quotes 28 stt. as from *Vyā. ya*, describing the famous Śaṅ.-Caṇḍāla encounter in Kāñcī but not even a single stanza is found in the printed edition of *Vyā. ya* though many of them are found verbatim in *Mād. ya*.

(ii) In its commentary on st. 18 of *G. R. M.*, *Suṣamā* quotes as from *Vyā. ya* one stanza शिवगुरुः स जरंखिसमे शिशौ etc., which is found verbatim in *Mād. ya* (IV. 11) but is found with some variations in *Vyā. ya* (XII. 116).²

1. The topic of Yogapaṭṭakas has been discussed in *Truth* (Chs. 13-14) and *JSMV* Pt. II, Ch. I, pp. 254-256.

2. The two stanzas are :

(i) त्रिसम एव शिशोर्जनको जरन् । अमृत कर्मवशः सुतमोदितः ।
उपनिनीषत् सन्तुमपि स्वयम् । न हि यमोऽत्र कृताकृतमीक्षते ॥ — *Vyā. XI. 116.*

(ii) शिवगुरुः स जरंखिसमे शिशौ । अमृत कर्मवशः सुतमोदितः ।
उपनिनीषितस्तुनुरपि स्वयम् । न हि यमोऽत्र कृताकृतमीक्षते ॥ — *S.S. Jaya IV. 11.*

These two instances, along with some others, have led the critics to conclude that that *Vyā. ya.* mentioned in *Suṣamā* is *Mād. ya* and *Vyā.* is *Mād.* only.

(iii) *Suṣamā* quotes as from *Vyā. ya.* 5 stanzas in its commentary on st. 33 of *G. R. M.* None but one stanza is, however, found in any of the 6 Mss. used for the edition of the *Vyā. ya.* and that one stanza also has important variants therein, containing a reference to स्वकलुस मठ of Śaṅ. and Śaṅ.'s passing away at Kāñci.¹

(iv) In its commentary on st. 33 of *G. R. M.*, *Suṣamā* quotes as from *K. Ś. V.* some (6 or 7) stanzas, bringing out Śaṅ.'s Mutt and his passing away at Kāñci but none of these stanzas is to be found in any of the 7 copies or editions of the work. All these 7 copies are with me.²

Br. Upa. Dīpikā, by Śaṅkarānanda has also been quoted by *Suṣamā* in its commentary on st. 77 of *G. R. M.* but in the only two Mss. of the same available at Adyar and Tanjore, the stanzas are not found.

In the edition, published by Jīvananda Vidyāsāgara in 1886 A.D. of *Ānanda-ya*, one of the mainstays of the K. Mutt, the passages pertaining to the establishment of a Mutt at Kāñci by Śaṅ., now found in the new edition from Madras,³ are not to be found. The variations in the birth particulars of Śaṅ. and some other details have been noted already.

The natural contention of the critics is that all this literature is highly suspect and cannot support the claim of the adherents of the Kāñci Mutt.

1. The stanza is :

एवं निरुत्तरपदां स विधाय देवीम् । सर्वज्ञपीठमभिरुह्य मठे स्वकलुसे ।
मात्रा गिरामपि तथोपगतेश्च मिश्रेः । संभावितः कमपि कालमुवास काञ्चन्याम् ॥

2. The stanzas are :

इति निश्चित्य मनसा श्रीमान् शङ्करदेशिकः । मठे श्रीशारदाभिरुह्ये सर्वज्ञं निदधन्मुनिम् ॥
सुरेश्वरं वृत्तिकृतमन्त्रिकस्थं तदाऽऽदरात् । समं संस्थाप्य तस्मै स्वं वक्तुं भाष्यं समन्वशात् ॥
स्वशिष्यपारम्पर्येण लिङ्गं संयोगनामकम् । सेवयैव कामकोटिपीठे सार्धं वसति च ।
इत्याज्ञां संप्रदायास्मै त्यक्त्वापीठमठस्पृहः । कामाक्ष्या निकटे जातु संनिविश्य जगद्गुरुः ॥
देहिभिर्देभ्यः भजे देहं तत्रैव स्वं त्यजन् । अखण्डज्योतिरानन्दमक्षरं परमं पदम् ॥
स एव शङ्कराचार्यो गुरुमुक्तिप्रदः सताम् । अद्यापि मूर्तं चैतन्यमिव तत्रैव तिष्ठति ॥

3. The passage is : (तस्मान् मुक्तिकाङ्क्षिभिः सर्वैश्चक्रपूजा कृतव्येति) निश्चित्य तत्रैव निजावाभ्योग्यं मठमपि परिकल्प्य तत्र निजसिद्धान्तपद्धतिमद्वैतं प्रकाशयितुमन्तेवासिनं सुरेश्वरमाहूय योगनामकं लिङ्गं पूजयेति तस्मै दत्त्वा त्वमत्र कामकोटिपीठमभिरुह्येति व्यवस्थाप्य शिष्यजनैः परिपूज्यमानः श्रीपरमगुरुः सुखमुवास ॥ Madras Edition, 1971, Ch. 65. It may be noted that neither the caption of Ch. 65 nor the colophon at the end of it makes any reference to the establishment of a Mutt at Kāñci by Śaṅ. Both the caption and the colophon mention श्रीचक्रप्रतिष्ठा and योगलिङ्गस्थापन only.

In addition to all this, Mr. Śarmā has given the following list of works which contain no reference to any Mutt established by Śaṅ. at Kāñci.

- (1) Keralotpatti
- (2) राजतरङ्गिणी — No reference
- (3) Sudhanvan's copper-plate, referred to and given in full in Vimarśa, a Dwārakā mutt publication
- (4) अष्टोत्तरशतनामावलि of Kumba. Mutt — mentions 4 मठ only
- (5) मठान्नाय — except मठान्नायसेतु
- (6) Ś. D. Sāra by Vrajarāja — Mr. Śarmā had obtained a copy of this work at Mirzapur
- (7) कृष्णपण्डितहरविजय, माधवीय (S. Ś. Jaya), व्यासाचलीय, (Ś. V.) चिद्विलासीय (Ś. V. Vilāsa) make no reference to a K. Mutt
- (8) G. V. K. — The reference to मठ at III. 23 is to residential Mutts only and not to an Āmnāya Mutt and these 5 मठ also do not include a Mutt at Kāñci.
- (9) शङ्कराचार्यसत्त्वय — the second of the three parts of Br. Ś. V. of Cit. The complete work is not available anywhere so far.
- (10) Śiva Rahasya as per the version of the Kumba. Mutt also does not mention any Mutt at Kāñci by Śaṅ.
- (11) Ś. V. S. by Jagannātha, Rāmakṛṣṇa and Bālakṛṣṇa Brahmānanda are not available anywhere but on the authority of some scholars in North India, Mr. Śarmā asserts that no mutt at Kāñci has been mentioned in any of these works. The names of these scholars have not been mentioned by Mr. Śarmā.¹

And, then, we come to the copper plate grants, produced by the K. Mutt to support their claim. Both Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Venkatraman have subjected these grants to a searching analysis and have tried to show that they do not bear out sufficiently clearly and beyond the pale of doubt the existence of an independent fifth Mutt established by Śaṅ. at Kāñci.² Their general conclusion is that though some of the C. Plates — not all

1. Vide JSMV p. 231 (top).

2. Prof. R. M. Umesh has critically examined the records of all the mutts available to him and though he has analysed the Copper-plate of King Sudhanvan as given in the Vimarśa of the Dwārakā Mutt, he has not touched upon these grants even indirectly.

— contain the expression Kāñcī Śāradā Mutt as also a reference to a head of the Mutt, the names of some of whom have also been mentioned in them, all this does not pertain to an independent Kāñcī Kāmakoṭī Mutt as claimed by its supporters but at the most, to a branch of the Śringerī Mutt only in Kāñcī, which alone is called a 'Śāradā mutt'. The arguments in details of these two critics are as follows.¹

(1) The grants (or C. Plates) produced by the K. Mutt are only 10 in number, as against 125 grants, consisting of 625 C. Plates, registered by a private servant (Mr. Baburao or Bapurao Joshi) of Col. Mackenzie in 1821 A. D. to have been found in the possession of the Kumba Mutt. The rest of the C. Plates were said to have been melted down for preparing copper vessels.²

(2) There is no reference, in any of these 10 grants in clear terms, to any Śaṅkarācārya as such. Whatever reference is found can apply to the head of any branch mutt of Śaṅ.

The word 'शंकरार्थ' in particular occurring in the first grant, cannot be equated with 'शंकराचार्य' because it is not found so used anywhere. Prof. H. H. Śāstri has objected to such an equation. Moreover, the word द्विजन्मा (a twice-born), and house or family name पोपिल्ली (Poppilli) applied to him, cannot denote a Sannyāsin. And, if he is परमजगद्गुरु, why should he not have been named ?

In some grants, names of the donees (here Mutt-heads) have been given as in Grants II, III, IV, V, VIII & X. In the first place, however, the शेषपदक (the special appellation added to the Sannyāsa names) इन्द्र-सरस्वती is not found except in the last i. e. No. X, सरस्वती only being used in the remaining five cases.

Secondly, the names of the heads of the Mutt do not tally with the corresponding names in the list of the heads of K. K. Mutt nor do the time-spans of some of them tally with the corresponding ones in the Mutt-list. As a matter of fact, the list of the Kumba-Mutt is all imaginary upto the end of the 17th cent. A.D. and these findings of discrepancies only confirm the same conclusion.

Thus, in Grant No. III, the donee महादेवसरस्वती is said to be the disciple of सदाशिवसरस्वती. This सदा० सर० is said to be the same as स्वामी सोमेश्वरानन्द, who is said by Bühler to have gone to Nepal from South India in

1. For these arguments, read : (i) *JSMV* Pt. II, Ch. V, pp. 427-465; (ii) *Myth* Ch. IX, pp. 59-72; (iii) *Truth* Pt. II, Ch. III, pp. 212-224.

2. Vide *JSMV* p. 429 (middle to end).

1503 A. D. G. R. M. refers to some सदा० सर० in connection with Nepal and hence the equation of सदा० सर० with स्वामी सोमे०. But this variation in the name of the Mutt's head is against यतिधर्मेशास्त्र. A mutt's head cannot have more than one Sannyāsa-name. If Bühler had known the connection between स्वामी सोमे० and the Kāñci mutt, he would have said so. Hence the स्वामी may have gone to Nepal on his own or he may have been sent by the Śringerī mutt, because the only दक्षिणाम्नायमठ was the Śringerī mutt, and no other.

In grant No. V, the donee is सदाशिवसरस्वती, the disciple of चन्द्रशेखरसर०, while one propaganda book and also a list of the heads of the K. mutt seem to suggest that the name of the head (in 1529 A. D., to which the grant relates) was सर्वेशसदा० बोध. According to Mr. Śarmā, the Grant gives the name as सदाशिव only.

In Grant No. X, the names of the heads of the K. Mutt do not tally with the date of the grant, viz. Ś. 1608 = 1686/7 A. D. The head of the mutt in 1687 A. D. was भगभवल्लामबोध (1638 A. D. to 1690/92 A. D.), the disciple of आहमबोध (1586 A. D. to 1638 A. D.). In the grant, the donee is महा० सर०, the disciple of चन्द्रशेखर सर०.

Regarding the dates, Ś. 1429 = 1507 A. D. mentioned in Gr. No. II as its date, does not tally with the 'शुक्ल' संवत्, which tallies with Ś. 1432 = 1510 A. D.

Secondly, Vīrasimha Nāyak, the donor of this grant, was, according to a book 'The Nayaks of Tanjor' by one Śrī Vṛddhagiriṣan, only an attendant in 1509 A. D. and hence could not issue any grant in 1507 A. D. Elsewhere, his edicts are available between 1510 A. D. & 1530 A. D. Hence, if the date is amended as 1510 A. D. (i. e. Ś. 1432), it tallies with Śukla but then the donee would be Candracūḍa (1507 A. D. - 1523 A. D.) and not महा० सर०.

In Grant No. III, given to the same donee as in Grant No. II in Ś. 1429 = 1507, the donor is again Vīrasimha Nāyak who, however, died in 1509 A. D., as per a book on Vijayanagar history. If therefore, the date Ś. 1429 = 1507 A. D. is amended as Ś. 1432 = 1510 A. D., he could not have given a grant in 1510 A. D.

In Grant No. IX, two stanzas have been taken over from शिवाष्टपदी, said to have been composed by चन्द्रशेखर सर० of Kāñci Mutt (1746-1783 A. D.). If this Firman — Gr. No. IX, belongs to 1677 A. D., it could not have quoted from शिवाष्टपदी of a later date. All the other stanzas in the Firman are in praise of Vijayanagar kings. These two stanzas, therefore,

could not have been a part of the Firman. The Firman, therefore, can not be considered to be genuine.

Lastly, in Grant No. X, the lunar eclipse does not tally with Ś. 1608 = 1687/8 A. D. and Ś. 1608 does not tally with महा० सर० (1704-1746 A. D.) onwards while the head of the K. Mutt in 1687/88 according to its own list of its heads is भगवन्नामबोधेन्द्र (1638 A. D. to 1690/92 A. D.). There was then no महा० सर०, disciple of चन्द्र० सर०.

Then, again, the name of the Delhi emperor has not been mentioned in the grant. Possibly, the sultan has issued the Firman as a servant of the kingdom. Or, perhaps, an order was issued by the Nawab of Golconda because at the time of the grant, the area from Madras to Vellore was under Maharashtra and some part of the eastern ocean-shore was under the Nawab of Golconda. This Firman i. e. Grant No. X also is imaginary and cannot be considered to be genuine.

The conclusion of the two critics, Mr. Sarma and Mr. K. K. Venkataraman, therefore, is, as stated earlier, that the C. Plate Grants do not bear out the establishment or existence of any fifth independent Kāñci Kāma Mutt. It is just "a pious myth." What looks like one can at best be a branch in Kāñci or Kumba of the Śringeri Śāradā mutt, that being the only Āmnāya mutt for the entire south, having jurisdiction over Kāñci also. The expression Śāradā or Kāñci Śāradā mutt points to such a मठ only and unless and until it is proved beyond doubt that the Kumba Mutt was called Śāradā Mutt, the existence of an independent fifth Mutt, as having been established by Śaṅ. cannot be accepted. Similarly, the names of certain donees, which sound like the names of the heads of such a fifth mutt, as given by P. Ś. M. and/or G. R. M., cannot be accepted as denoting or pointing to such a Mutt. What is claimed as such a one, is nothing but the Kumba Mutt, which started in Tanjore and then went to Kumba. and except for 6 or 7 Ācāryas belonging to this Mutt, all the list of Gurus or Ācāryas, as per P. Ś. M. and G. R. M. is a concocted and imaginary one, being just a string of names of eminent and leading figures in the social, political, religious and academic fields in Indian history. As there is no original Mutt at Kāñci, there is no question of its being shifted to Tanjore and Kumba and all the story of such a shifting is also a concocted one. The failure on the part of the K. Mutt followers to give one consistent date i. e. year of such a shifting, points to the same conclusion.

Mr. Śarmā differentiates now and again between an Āmnāya Mutt and a residential (निवासी) Mutt, firmly maintaining that Śaṅ. established

4 Āmnāya mutts only. According to him, a residential Mutt is for the purposes of study &c. and is an abode for students, celibates and sannyāsins. An Āmnāya Mutt, however, is a religious institution or centre, invested by its founder with Āmnāya status by a special proclamation and then having a special nomenclature of its own, such as तीर्थ, क्षेत्र, सम्प्रदाय; वेद, महावाक्य, योगपट्टक etc., which are lacking in the case of the Kāñcī or even Kumba - Mutt, whatever particulars are given by the K. Mutt supporters being open to objection. The K. K. Mutt is one of the many Upāsana Pithas in existence even before Śaṅ, but that does not make it an आम्नायमठ.¹

As a matter of fact, if the K. Kāma-Mutt was in Kāñcī, why should there be a reference to Śāradā, which applies to the Śringeri Mutt only? Possibly, this was because it was a Śrī. Śāradā Mutt-branch. Vijayanagar kings gave everything to the Śrī. Mutt and hence gifts to the Kāñcī Mutt were also given as Śāradā Mutt only. So Kāñcī mutt was a Śrī. Mutt branch only.

Kumba. Mutt argues that so long as another Mutt is not shown in Kāñcī, K. Śāradā mutt mentioned in the grants will be the K. Kāma. Mutt only, but this is answered by the fact that there was a Veda-mutt, Śaiya, Bauddha and Jain mutts and according to one stone-inscription, a Śaṅkara-dāsa Sannyāsīn was staying in a Kāñcī Mutt. Hence, so long as K. Śāradā mutt is not proved to be the K. Kāma. mutt, it will be wrong to have it as an independent Āmnāya mutt. It has been shown that all the grants pertained to the Śrī. Śāradā mutt only in the name of the Kāñcī Śāradā mutt.

A number of other arguments have also been put forward by Mr. Śaramā in particular as follows :²

1. Vide *Myth* pp. 20-21; *JSMV* pp. 302-03 &c.; सत्यान्वेषण pp. 12-13.
2. These arguments lie scattered in his three books. Many of them will be found in his pamphlet - one of these three - viz. सत्यान्वेषण, 1971 A. D. It is not possible to quote numbers of pages for each. They are present in *Truth* also. A few may be indicated as under :
 - (1) Mahāvākya (i) सत्यान्वेषण pp. 20-21; (ii) *Truth* pp. 111-16.
 - (2) Yogapattaka (i) सत्यान्वेषण pp. 14-15; (ii) *Truth* Ch. XII, pp 117 etc.
 - (3) Rāmānuja (i) *Myth* pp. 20-21; (ii) *JSMV* p. 385; (iii) *Truth* pp. 181/2.
 - (4) Tippu/Walajah (i) *Myth* p. 17; (ii) सत्यान्वेषण p. 11; (iii) *Truth* pp. 181/1.
 - (5) A stanger to Kāñcī (i) *Myth* p. 18; (ii) सत्यान्वेषण p. 10.
 - (6) Chikku Swāmī (i) *Myth* p. 19; (ii) सत्यान्वेषण pp. 10-11; (iii) *JSMV* pp. 384, 387, 461, 554 etc. (iv) *Truth* pp. 179, 254.
 - (7) Appaya Dixit (i) *Myth* p. 21; (ii) *Truth* p. 21.
 - (8) All Kumba. Mutt heads were Kannadigas (i) सत्यान्वेषण p. 10; (ii) *Truth* pp. 179, 248.

(Continued on the next page)

(1) The Chingleput office decisions (Madras G. O. 1280, dt. 19. 8. 1935) have described the Kāñcī mutt head as a Cikkudiar Swāmī (i. e. a subordinate or junior Swāmī-Cikka = small), which implies a Doḍḍayyar (senior) Swāmī (Doḍḍa = large) and that is Śrī. Mutt Swāmī only.

(2) When Kumba Swāmī (i. e. Mutt-head) entered Kāñcī in 1837 A. D. to perform Kumbhābhiṣekam to Goddess Kāmākṣī, Chingleput Collector's report refers to the Swāmiji as "a stranger to Kāñcī."

(3) The earlier seal of the Kumba. Mutt was in Kannada and all Kumba. Swāmijis, except Sri Jayendra Sara. have been Kannadigas.

(4) Rānānujācārya was studying under Yādava-Prakāśa in Kāñcī. He disagreed with the Advaita-Vedānta of Śaṅ. He went to Yāmunācārya of Śrīraṅgam. If Kāñcī Śaṅ. were there, why did he not seek him out for explanation?

(5) In 1763 A. D., a dispute arose in Kāñcī regarding Varnāśrama Dharma and then, the same was referred by the Nawab of Walajabad to the Śrī. Swāmiji, who had the authority to decide religious disputes in south India, including Kāñcī.

(6) In 1792 A. D., Tipu Sultan got the Ekāmreśvara temple rebuilt and then requested Śrī. Swāmiji to go over to Kāñcī and perform its inauguration or consecration by means of ಸಮರ್ಪಣ.

In both these cases, why was the Kāñcī Swāmiji not asked to do these things, if he were there?

(7) The trusteeship of the Kāñcī temple was also granted to the Kumba. Mutt in 1842 A. D. on the basis of wealth and property held by that Mutt. It had no powers and claims otherwise over the temple.

(8) Chwang Yuang records most of the philosophers in the South but he makes no reference to any Śaṅ. or to any Śaṅ. Mutt at Kāñcī.

(9) In his discourses on the life of Śrī Ādi Śaṅ., the present Paramācārya of the Kāñcī mutt mentions 4 ṛṣis only as having been established by him. He makes no reference whatever to any mutt at Kāñcī.

(Continued from the last page)

(9) All Mutt seals in Kannada, *Myth* p. 19.

(10) Trusteeship of Kāmākṣī Mandir, *Myth* p. 18.

Most of these arguments will be found in Mr. Sharma's *JSMV*, though not listed above,

(10) Arguments pertaining to the absence for the K. K. Mutt of (i) a Veda out of the 4 Vedas (ii) Mahāvākya and (iii) A yogapattaka have been reinforced by the critics as follows :

(i) There are 4 Vedas only, all of which have been assigned to the 4 Āmnāya mutts. The Kāma. mutt claims for itself RV. and not YV., to which Śaṅ. belonged. Again, this RV. belongs to the Govardhana mutt at Puri. Moreover, the Mahāvākya *Om Tat Sat* claimed by the Kāma. Mutt for its Ācāryas as their Mahāvākya does not belong to the RV. — in fact to any Veda.

(ii) Regarding the Mahāvākya, both the critics (Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Iyer) point out that according to the गुरुहस्योपनिषद्, there are 4 Mahāvākyas only, which do not contain the so-called Mahāvākya *Om Tat Sat* claimed by the K. Mutt for itself. Just as it does not belong to any Veda, it does not belong to any Upaniṣad also. A Mahāvākya is that which conveys or expresses the identity of Jīva and Śiva (i. e. the individual soul and the Supreme soul). *Om Tat Sat* does not do so and hence it cannot be accepted as a Mahā. — much less as that of the K. Mutt. In fact, the words *Om Tat Sat* are just a group of synonymous words only and not a Vākya at all. Nor can they be said to be an उपलक्षण i. e. standing for all the Mahāvākyas because such उपलक्षण must contain something that is denoted as in the sentence कर्केभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यताम्. Initiation into all the 4 Mahāvākyas also cannot be said to be peculiar to the Saraswati order of Sannyāsins because the Sannyāsins of all the 10 orders are at the time of initiation into Sannyāsa are initiated into all the 4 Mahāvākyas, with the only difference that the Mahāvākya of the particular Veda, to which the initiate belongs, is taught to him first.

(iii) Regarding the Yoga-pattakas, there are 10 Yogas only (दश योगः), as said by Mr. Jadunātha Sarkār. They are said by some to have been formed by Śaṅ., and by others, to have been only reorganised by him. There is no Yoga. beyond these ten. These ten have been distributed among the 4 Āmnāya Pīthas, none, therefore, being left for the Kāma. Mutt. The title (i. e. Yoga) हृन्द्सरस्वती claimed by this mutt is one of the two sub-divisions of the title सरस्वती, the other being आनन्दसरस्वती, but these are of recent origin and do not date from the time of Śaṅ. Moreover, the हृन्द्सर. title is not at all exclusive to the K. Kāma Mutt as it is held by a number of Sannyāsins outside the lineage of the K. K. Mutt. Mr. Iyer gives a list of Sannyāsins who have enjoyed this title. Even this title is, however, not found in any of the C. Plates of the K. K. Mutt, except the last one No. X, the genuineness of which is doubtful.

(11) Even as the late Mr. K. S. Sunderamaih did earlier, (i. e. in 1958), so also Mr. R. G. Śarmā refers to the famous *Banāras Vyavasthā* of 1886, when it was declared unanimously by the Pandits of Banāras that Śaṅ. had established only 4 Āmnāya Mutts and that this decision was confirmed at the Biharipur Mutt Sabhā in 1934 ("with greater vehemence" — Mr. Sunderamaih). The latter also laid down that the *Maṭhāmnāya* and Sri Vidyāranya's *Śaṅ. Digvijaya* were the only authoritative works¹ Mr. Śarmā has developed this particular point at very great length in his earlier book काशी में कुम्भकोणमठविषयक विवाद wherein he traces the development of the K. K. Mutt claims, culminating in the visit of the K. K. Mutt Swāmiji (present Paramācārya) to Benares in 1934 A. D., the opposition put up against this visit, particularly in regard to the 'fanciful' claims by the said mutt and their sequel.

Later on in 1971 A. D., Mr. Śarmā also addressed a personal letter to Śri Jayendra Saraswati of K. K. Mutt, registering his protest against the several 'fanciful' claims and false statements made by the K. Mutt supporters, the various objections against their claims and replies to their various statements, and finally requesting him to desist from such propaganda.²

Mr. K. P. Sunil even went to the extent of saying that it was only in the 20th century works, all compiled after Paramācārya became the head of the K. K. Mutt, that the history of the Kāñci mutt was rewritten³ (Śaṅ.'s establishing a मठ and passing away at Kāñci etc.). When it was pointed out that Paramācārya became the head of the Mutt in 1907 A. D. at the age of 13 yrs. only and that he could not have started preparing all the evidence at that age, — that the evidence was of much earlier times,⁴ — he replied by saying that the K. Mutt assumed the present position during his tenure of office and hence the evidence can be attributed or credited to him.⁵ He says that historians hold that the K. Mutt was a branch of the Śrī. Mutt, was established in 1821 A. D. by the Tanjore king and later became independent. Even Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Iyer have said that the Kāñci or rather the Kumbha Mutt was one of those mutts which initially started as branches of one or the other of 4 principal Śaṅ. Mutts but later on, renounced their allegiance to the parent mutt and assumed independence — Kumba. Mutt went to the length of

1. Vide *JSMF* p. 55, 1934.

2. This is the same as सत्यान्वेषण, 1971.

3. Vide 'Disputed Lineage' by Mr. K. P. Sunil, *Illus. Weekly*, p. 13; 13.9.87.

4. Vide "Authentic Heritage" by Sri R. G. K., *Illus. Weekly*, p. 44, 22.11.87.

5. Vide "Much Ado about nothing" by Mr. K. P. Sunil, *Illus. Weekly*, p. 44, 13.12.87.

maintaining that it was established by Śaṅ. himself and was supreme among all the Śaṅ. mutts.¹ He also points out — and that is a fact also — that in a series of lectures bearing on the life of Śaṅ, Paramācārya mentions only the 4 well-known mutts as having been established by Śaṅ. He does not mention any at Kāñcī.

(12) Lastly, the critics — Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Venkataraman — cite the opinions and statements of eminent persons and scholars like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Dr. S. K. Belvalkar etc, foreigners like Burnell and others and many judges, who had occasion to try cases between the two rival mutts, Śrī. and Kāñcī in particular, to the effect that Śaṅ. had established 4 Mutts only and not 5.

My observations :

As I have said at the beginning of this discussion, the real source of all this Śaṅ. business is, at least at present, what in generic terms can be called the Śaṅ. Vijayas, the precise title being different in many cases. Even though some Purāṇas also give some information, it gives none regarding the establishment of any mutt by Śaṅ. at any place.

Regarding the Śaṅ. Vijayas, after going through 18 such biographies, all in Sanskrit, I have come to the conclusion that none of them can be considered to be very reliable historically, except for a broad outline of some main events in Śaṅ.'s life. The establishment of Mutts is one such event and the picture we get is not very satisfactory, encouraging or convincing. All the Śaṅ. Vijayas that are available today are removed from Śaṅ.'s time by centuries, even after taking the latest date — 788 A. D. to 820 A. D. for the purpose.

Now, if the non-mention of a Mutt at Kāñcī in the Śaṅ-V.s is accepted as a criterion, we shall find that except for 4 out of 18 Śaṅ. V.s² — 3 out of these 4 are very recent, being of the 19th and 20th cent. A. D. — no Ś. V. mentions the establishment of a Mutt at Dwārakā, Badari and Purī. The argument of Mr. Sunil regarding the non-mention of a Kāñcī mutt by Vyā. in his Ś. V. loses its force because even the Śrī. Mutt has not been specifically stated to have been established by Śaṅ. at Śrīgerī in the Mād-ya, attributed by the same mutt to Śrī Vidyātanya Muni, who is also regarded by it as one of the most illustrious heads of that Mutt and whose work, S. Ś.

1. Vide *Myth* pp.10-11; *Truth* pp.2-5.

2. The four are : G. F. K., *Bhag. Daya*, Anantānandagiri's *Ś. V.* and *Ś. V. Vilāsa* of Cid.

jaya a/s *Mād-ya*, is the most authoritative biography of Śaṅ. for them as also for the Kāñi Pandits. The *Mād-ya* mentions an āśrama only as having been started or established by Śaṅ. at Śrī. Even Mr. R. G. Śarmā, a very staunch supporter of the Śrī. Mutt and a severe critic of the K. K. Mutt admits this fact and remarks at two places that the establishment of a mutt at Śrī. in the *S. Ś. Jaya* i. e. *Mād-ya* has only to be inferred or understood by suggestion.¹ As per Mr. Sunil's reasoning, then, either Vidyāranya was not the head of the Śrī. mutt or there was no mutt at Śringerī. This point will be discussed further while discussing the question of the location of the Śrī. Mutt.

On the contrary, it is the *Śaṅkara Vijaya* of Anantānandagiri that mentions explicitly, even in its 'unembellished' edition, the establishment of a Mutt at Śrī. but this work has been discredited by that mutt and the critics of the K. K. Mutt as a most valueless one. If, therefore, the criterion of non-mention of a mutt in the Ś. V.'s is to be insisted upon, we shall have to say that the establishment of a Mutt at three other places at least, if not at Śrī., also, will have to be considered as doubtful as that of a mutt at Kāñcī. Though epigraphical evidence put forward by the K. K. Mutt in support of its claim is said to be open to doubt and hence cannot be considered to be conclusive, even such a semblance of evidence, except an equally doubtful copperplate attributed to one King Sudhanvan, is not available in the case of these three mutts at Dwārakā, Badari and Puri.

Now, out of the three or four Ś. V.s that mention clearly the establishment of all the four Mutts by Śaṅ., two are *Guru Vamśa Kāvya* and *Bhagavatpādābhyaṅga* in order of time (the other two being the Ś. V.s of Anantā. and Cid.). Out of those two, the latter i. e. *Bh. Daya* mentions explicitly the establishment of a Mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī., though it is said to have been for the advancement of learning.² It may, of course, be added that the other 4 mutts also are said to have been established by Śaṅ. for the same purpose, viz. propagation of his own philosophy, lest it should languish and be forgotten. The mutts are actually called विद्यामठ (Vide IX : 15 to 18, particularly IX : 16). The difference in the description of this Mutt at Kāñcī and the other four Mutts is that the other particulars such as the name of the Pīṭha, its first Ācārya, its veda etc., mentioned in the case of those other four Mutts, described later, are absent in the case of this Kāñcī mutt.

1. Vide *JSMF* pp. 179, 476.

2. Vide *Bhag. Daya*. VIII : 79 (मठं संस्थापयामास तत्र विद्याभिरुद्धये ।).

The case of *G. V. K.* is more significant than this. It refers to Śaṅ.'s contemplating in Vārāṇasī five Mutts (III. 23), four for his principal disciples and one for himself. The curious thing is that the four Mutts have been described at some length but the 5th Mutt has not been specified. Now, in a note on (the work) *G. V. K.* of the Śrī. Mutt in the Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological Dept., University of Mysore, for the year 1928 A. D., the writer remarks, "The author says that he (i. e. Śaṅ.) set up five mutts and mentions the names of Śringerī, Badarī, Kāśī, Purī and Kāñcī."¹ Kāśī is obviously a mistake because while allocating the disciples, he puts Hastāmālaka in the west which, according to *G. V. K.*, is Dwārakā. The text of *G. V. K.*, as available at present, contains no reference to the Kāñcī Mutt anywhere though, as said before, Śaṅ. is said to have established five Mutts, the 5th being for himself. The work, however, mentions no Mutt established at Kāñcī. This seems to show that originally the reference to the Kāñcī mutt was present in the work but was subsequently removed though the mention of the five Mutts was allowed to remain. This omission can be said to be analogous to the omission of all references to Kāñcī in Śuddhānanda Bhārati's book on Śaṅ, subject to which only a Śrī-mukha was given for the same by the Śrī. Ācārya.²

According to Mr. K. R. Venkataraman, the 4 mutts mentioned at *G. V. K.* (ch. III : 59 to 63) are different from the 5 Mutts mentioned at *G. V. K.* III. 23. The 5 Mutts, according to him, are only residential Mutts while the four Mutts in III : 59-63 are (the well known) Āmnāya mutts.³ The text of ch. III, however, contains no clue to this distinction between the two (kinds of) references. It is obvious that a mutt at Kāñcī is sought to be excluded somehow. Such an understanding leads to the very awkward understanding of the two passages to mean that Śaṅ. established a total number of 9 mutts, 5 residential and 4 Āmnāya, which has no warrant or precedent anywhere. As a matter of fact, *G. V. K.* III : 23 does not necessarily mean that Śaṅ. contemplated the establishment of 5 mutts at Kāśī. It only seems to mean that after Śaṅ. went to Kāśī, he contemplated there at Kāśī the establishment of 5 mutts, 4 mutts for his disciples and one for himself. This also obviates the very awkward interpretation referred to above.

G. V. K. III : 23, which says that Śaṅ. contemplated (प्रकल्प्य), not established, 5 Mutts at Kāśī or Vārāṇasī, also tells us that he stayed

1. Vide p. 16 of the said report.

2. Vide *Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarite Institutions* by Sri Ananta. Saras. p. 153.

3. Vide *G. V. K.*, p. 32 of English Notes (1966 Edition).

there for a few days and then went to Kāśmīra for ascending the सर्वज्ञपीठ (III : 24). Thence, he came down to Śrīn. from where he went to the North again, always accompanied by his disciples. Immediately, thereafter, he instructed his disciples to go and stay at the 4 Mutts (Āmnāya), the establishment of which seems to have taken place already (I.I : 59 to 62). At Dwārakā, Hastāmālaka is said to have established a Mutt and occupied it (III : 62).

Now, if we were to understand the word प्रकल्प्य in III : 23 to mean 'having established' and then that the Mutts mentioned in III : 59-62 are those mutts only (the critics of the K. K. Mutt do not hold this view), the distinction between the Mutts in III : 23 and those in III : 59-62 will vanish, except that the 5th Mutt becomes excluded from the latter.

When, after visiting Badarī, Śaṅ. comes to Kāśī, he is said to have stayed in the city of Kāśī for some time. Throughout this context and in the earlier one also i. e. before he went to Kāśmīra, when he stayed in Kāśī for some days (III : 23), there is no reference whatsoever to this Mutt or to his having stayed in his own Mutt there, where he should have stayed at least while he was in Kāśī, if he had any mutt there for himself. None of the 4 disciples has also been said to have stayed in his own Mutt at Kāśī even for a few days. They straightaway went to their Āmnāya mutts at the instance of Śaṅ. (vide III : 63 in particular), who himself started towards Nepal (III : 63). There is obviously no question of their coming back to Kāśī again and staying in their respective 'residential mutts' there. Even if, then, they were to have stayed there, are we to believe that Śaṅ. established there in Kāśī those Mutts just for a few days' stay and that too at one place only, quite removed from the Āmnāya mutts in the 4 corners of India? As said earlier, no other biography of Śaṅ. (*Śaṅkara Vijaya*) or any other work, giving biographical information about Śaṅ. contains even a remote reference to or suggestion about these 5 mutts of Śaṅ. in Kāśī. The obvious inference is that G. V. K. did mention 5 Mutts and also the names of their locations, but while the 5 mutts remained in the text, the names of the locations were removed later on, presumably at the time of publication or about that time, as these names were inconvenient to those who did not favour a fifth Mutt at Kāñcī. The explicit reference to a Mutt at Kāñcī by Śaṅ. himself, without the other particulars but with श्रीचक्रस्थापना (and not renovation only, as repeatedly and insistently maintained by Mr. Śarma) still stands in the *Bhagavatpādābhyaṅgī*, the author of which work also is an adherent of the Śrīn. Mutt. The omission of Kāñcī in the *Guru Vaṁśa Kāvya* thus becomes highly suspect.

There appears to be a strange or an interesting parallel between the *G. V. K.* text here and that of the *Kūḍali Śrī. Guruparamparā* or the *Hultzsch ms.*, except for some minor details. Both the texts say that Śaṅ. placed Viśvarūpa (i. e. Sureśvara) in charge of the place where he worshipped Sarasvatī, stayed there for a long time and then went to Kāñci. The main and important point of difference is that according to *G. V. K.*, Śaṅ. placed Viśvarūpa i. e. Sureśvara at Śrī. to be followed by Nityabodhaghana while according to the *Kūḍali Śrī. Paramparā* or *Dr. Hultzsch's Ms.* Śaṅ. placed श्रीधरयति at Kūḍali, to be followed by Viśvarūpa.

It is indeed worth noting that there is no specific reference to Śringerī by name or to the establishment of any mutt there, till the end of ch. III of *G. V. K.* We are told that he came with आकाशवाणी to ऋष्यशृङ्गाश्रम, where, at a pleasant spot on the bank of Tungabhadra river, he worshipped the Goddess and stayed there with his disciples for a long time. Then he handed over to Viśva.-Sure, the चन्द्रमौलीश्वरलिङ्ग, रत्नगर्भगणपति, given to him by सुनिद्ध (Govindamuni or Revana) and asked him to stay there and worship Sarasvatī (*G. V. K.* — ch. III: 30-34). In ch. IV: st. I, occurs the first reference to the mutt, but it is nowhere called शारदामठ. On the contrary, *G. V. K.* itself calls it श्रीमठ four times and the महात्म्याs too, excepting those sponsored by the Śrī. Mutt, call it श्रीमठ or शृंगेरीमठ. Even the *Cid.ya* calls it श्रीमठ (XXIV: 33, 34). The reference to शृंगपुरी or शृङ्गनगर only and not as शृङ्गेरी proper occurs in ch. IV and onwards (*G. V. K.* IV: 31, 32, 33, VII: 48 etc.).

Other authorities

At the very outset, I feel constrained to remark very painfully that it is singularly unfortunate indeed that the Kāñci Mutt has not cared to preserve and if they have preserved, they have not thought it necessary to bring out so many important and what are likely to prove vital works like *Brhat Ś. V.*, *Pr. Ś. V.* and *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa* in particular and others also from which they quote profusely from time to time, on which they base their own claim and which would have helped in clinching the issue one way or the other.

I have said enough about the probability of the existence at one time of *Br. Ś. V.* and *Pr. Ś. V.* in my article in the *Journal of the Bombay University*.¹ Mr. T. S. Nārāyaṇa Śāstri definitely seems to have had with him the e two works, possibly along with a number of other works like *Gauḍa-padollāsa*, *Harimīśriya*, *Śaṅ. Vilāsa* and so on. I have it on the

1. Vide Arts Number, No. 35, pp. 113-121; Sept. 1960,

authority of very reliable persons that the Kāñci Swāmiji — the late Paramācārya — had shown either of the first two works, at least to three persons so far. Hence, I still believe, even more strongly than before, that the first three works — at least *Br. Ś. V.* — did exist and perhaps is still there in the Kāñci mutt library or with the Swāmiji himself which, however, for some reasons best known to the Swāmiji only, have not been brought out and made available to the scholars or to the public till today. I have been trying to obtain them for the last 35 years and yet, have failed to do so upto date. For these very reasons I cannot accept that these works are just the figments of imagination of the author of *Suśamā* and that all the quotations given by him as from these works were his own.”¹

Regarding this *Brhat Ś. V.*, Mr. Śarmā says clearly at two places that the second part of the same, called *वाङ्मयसत्य* exists in the Dwārakā Mutt library but that the whole work is not available. He only remarks that this part contains no reference to the establishment of a Mutt at Kāñci.” And, inspite of all this, he describes the work as ‘unknown and not available (अनजान और अनुपलब्ध)’. It is really a pity that he did not try to bring the work to light, when he seems to be very particular about *सत्यान्वेषण*.

Regarding Mr. R. K. Iyer’s remarks about Citsukha’s role in the crocodile incident, I feel firstly that he has taken the words of *Suśamā अनुक्षण-मुपचरित-आचार्यचरणा* etc. too literally. Mr. T. S. N. Śāstri says very clearly that Viṣṇuśarman a/s Citsukha was a native of Gokarṇa and was a co-student of Śaṅ. at the Gurukula. Later, he joined Śaṅ. at Gokarṇa when the latter set out in search of his Guru or Master. Unless, therefore, Mr. Śāstri is to be set aside outright on account of “fondness for misquotation” and perhaps as a liar also, Cit. was not at all present at the time of the crocodile incident.

Secondly, even if Cit. is taken to have been present, he was not the only person present on the bank of the river at the time and obviously, he was as helpless as the others to help Śaṅ., even the mother included. The strength of the crocodile inside water is proverbial and should not have been unknown to Mr. Iyer.

Regarding the criticism of Prof. Umesh, some flaws in versification need not make the work spurious. Such flaws or irregularities can be found in other works also. Regarding Kumārila and Mahāvīra being contem-

1. Vide *Kāma. Śata.* p.11 (line 3); p.77.

2. Vide *JSMV* pp.145, 246, Reference to Dwārakā Mutt and the contents of *Br. Ś. V.* are found at the second place,

poraries, as reportedly said in the *Br. Ś. V.*, initially the objection is worth consideration, particularly in view of what he has shown in his book (*Śaṅ.'s Date*), viz. that Śaṅ. cannot be placed before 500 A. D. at the earliest. But *Mād.ya.* also mentions जिनहस्ति as the opponents of Kumā, though Mahā. has not been named therein. Vyā. mentions Jains only as the opponents of Kumā, while Sadā. and Cid. mention Jains as well as the Buddhists as the opponents. The mention of Mahā. is obviously suspicious at least at the present juncture i. e. till the date of Śaṅ. is finally settled beyond doubt. Regarding the astronomical details, it has been found that there is sufficient room for difference in interpretation of such details and no one opinion can be said to be final or conclusive. In spite of all discrepancies, many other works like *K. Ś. V.*, *S. Ś. Jaya* or the *Mād. ya* etc. have not been discarded altogether. In fact, if discrepancies like historical anachronisms in *Mād. ya.* can be explained and condoned on the ground of its being a Kāvya, the author of which is said to have taken some liberties, there is all the greater reason for overlooking them in a work centuries earlier than the earliest biography of Śaṅ. available to us today — and that is about the 14th or 15th cent. A. D. — and particularly till such time as the original *Br. Ś. V.* becomes available and Śaṅ.'s date is also finally settled, it is better to suspend our judgment.

Regarding *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa* by Vākpati Bhaṭṭa also, I wish to place it on record that during my first meeting with Mr. R. G. Śarmā at his residence at Bangalore many years ago (about 1981 A. D.), he had told me definitely and very clearly not only that this work existed in Mss. form in the Punjab University Library (he had called it Lahore Oriental Library) but that he had also procured for himself two paper ms. copies of the same, one of which he had deposited in the Dwārakā Mutt Library and the other was with him, either in Banaras or it was handed over to the Śrī. mutt alongwith all the other papers — books, booklets etc., about 70 in number. My best efforts including those at the Central Govt. level, through two Prime Ministers, the late Honorable Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the Honorable Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, both of whom were good enough to direct the I. C. H. R. in New Delhi and through Dr. Mrs. Kapila Vatsyayan, Ministry of Education, N. Delhi, who tried her best at the instance of Dr. R. N. Dandekar, B. O. R. I., Poona, and then those through the J. N. Library (i. e. Bombay University Library) — to contact the said Punjab University Library, did not elicit even a formal acknowledgment. My personal efforts to locate this work with persons and libraries in India and abroad, which also have ended in failure so far, were in addition to these efforts. I am only surprised that Mr. Śarmā, who, along with the other critics who

are loud in calling for their original authorities from the K. Mutt, should depose to its non-existence altogether calling it अनजान और अनुपलब्ध (unknown and not available anywhere, inspite of a search in libraries at many places),¹ when as a matter of fact, he ought to have brought it out and made it known and available to scholars and students interested in the subject of Śaṅ.'s life.

Secondly, one Swāmi Sakhyānandaji from Trichur has published in Malayalam a book entitled आर्षभारतपारम्पर्यम्, wherein he has devoted seven chapters to Śrī Ādi Śaṅ. Therein he gives a very detailed account of Śrī Abhinava Śaṅkara hailing from Cidambaram. In reply to my query as to whether he had seen the book *Śaṅkara Vilāsa*, he said that he had not only seen the book but had also gone through the same and that he had based his account of Śrī Abhi. Śaṅ. on that book only. He had, however, seen the book about 40 years ago and was unable to enlighten me as to the present whereabouts of the same. Swāmiji has said in his book clearly that Abhi. Śaṅ. was the head of the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt as early as the 9th century A. D. If this is really so, we can very well imagine why Mr. Śarmā has allowed the book to remain in oblivion – untraced till today. He is so very opposed to that Mutt. It may be noted that he has himself suggested that the Kāñci Mutt has perhaps destroyed the remaining Copper-plates (other than the 10 that have been published) because " the inscriptions therein contained inconvenient truths and inconvenient to Kāñci Mutt. "² The same suggestion applies even more strongly to his own role in the matter of *Śaṅ. Vilāsa*.

Anandagiriya

Regarding this book, I wish to discuss a few points only.

This work has been criticised for several reasons. A major reason is the particulars given therein about Śaṅ.'s parents (Sarvajit and Viśiṣṭā as against the usual names Śivaguru and Āryāmbā) and birth-place (Cidambaram as against the usual Kālaṭi). I have said enough about this point in my thesis and my article in the Bombay University Journal³ and even though Swāmi Tapasyānandaji says that it is not conclusive,⁴ I must submit that the evidence adduced by me in that regard is quite strong and needs to be rebutted specifically and more convincingly.

1. Vide *JSMV* pp. 114, 257.

2. Vide *Myth* p. 60 (top).

3. Vide Arts Number, No. 36, Bombay University Journal, Vol. XXX (New Series) Part II, pp. 78-80, Sept. 1961.

4. Vide Introduction p. xxxi to *Śaṅ. Dig.* English Trans. of *S. Ś. Jaya* of Mād. by Swāmi Tapasyānanda, published by Rāmakṛṣṇa Māṭha, Mylapore. 1980.

Swāmi Tapasyānandaji, who does not agree with the conclusion of Dr. Veezinathan that the Cidambaram text is a later interpolation, holds that that same text is also prepared by equally great scholars and as such, it should be given at least an equal place of importance as the one cited by Dr. Veezinathan.¹ I wish to address the same plea with regard to the Kālaḍi text adopted by Dr. Veezinathan and feel that it should not be ruled out altogether. The work of Anantānandagiri should, therefore, not be regarded as one giving some subversive particulars about Śaṅ.'s life and hence being absolutely unreliable, as is found to have been done by the critics of the K. K. Mutt, who do not seem to accept that there is also another side of the matter equally worthy of consideration.

The other observation of Swāmiji, however, that in the Calcutta Edition, Anantā, is giving the life-account or history not of Ādi Śaṅ. born at Kālaḍi from Śiva. and Āryāmbā but of another Śaṅ. born from Sarva. and Viśiṣṭā at Cidambaram² is absolutely untenable and unacceptable. Except that he is born from these two parents at Cidam., there is nothing that bears out a character different from that of Ādi Śaṅ. In the first place, these details are themselves the bone of contention regarding the validity or otherwise of the work, the other set of details being those that agree with Ādi Śaṅ. only. Secondly, all the events and incidents, subsequently described about this Śaṅ. — Govindamuni being his preceptor, the discussion with Maṇḍana, the incident of परकायाप्रवेश, writing of Bhāṣyas and so on, all pertain to Kālaḍi Śaṅ. only. In fact, this conformity between Kālaḍi Śaṅ. and these incidents described in the work should be an argument in favour of the Kālaḍi text rather than in that of the Cidam. text. Swāmiji's argument that the routes of Śaṅ.'s 'triumphant tour' (Digvijaya Yātrā), described in the Calcutta edition are different from those Śaṅ. is said in other Ś. V.s to have taken³ is absolutely pointless because almost no two sets of routes in the different Ś. V.s agree with each other. I have given in my thesis, quite a few, all differing from one another.⁴ Moreover, whatever the difference

1. Ibid. p. xxxi (Intro.).

2. Ibid. pp. xxxi-xxxii (Intro.), also *Kāma. Śāra.* p. 81 (last 4 lines) and p. 86.

3. Vide Intro. p. xxxii (top) as in FN. 1.

4. These routes may be noted for ready reference as follows :

- (1) व्यासाचल — श्रीवल्लीग्राम-गोकर्ण-काञ्ची-काश्मीर He gives these 4 only.
- (2) गोविन्दनाथ — शिवविहाराख्यग्राम-हरिद्वार-काञ्ची, कालहस्ती-पुण्डरीकपुर-श्रीरङ्गम्-रामसेतु-काञ्ची-वृषाचल (केरल)
- (3) चिद्विलास — तुङ्गभद्रातट-काञ्ची-वेङ्कटेश्वर-चिदम्बर-मध्याहुन-रामसेतु-वक्रतुण्डपुरी-मदुरा-अनंतशयन-वासुकीक्षेत्र-मृडपुरी-गोकर्ण-श्रीशैल-पांडुरंगक्षेत्र जगन्नाथपुरी-उज्जैन-द्वारका-वृंदावन-मथुरा-गोकुल-कुलक्षेत्र-मायापुरी-बदरिवन

(Continued on the next page)

in details otherwise, all the editions and even the available Mss of this work of Anantānandagiri, including the Calcutta Edition, agree in saying that Śaṅkarācārya passed away at Kāñcī. No other Śaṅ. is said or known to have passed away at Kāñcī.

Swāmiji suggests that possibly, this Cidam. Śaṅ. is the Abhinava Śaṅkara whom even modern scholars have mistakenly identified with Ādi Śaṅ. But, then, this Abhinava Śaṅ. is known to have passed away in the Himalayas, in the Dattātreyā cave. In fact, it is more probable that someone has transferred the details of the birth-place and parents of this Abhi. Śaṅ. to Ādi Śaṅ., while all the other details pertaining to Ādi. Śaṅ. have been allowed to remain in the work as they were. And, if this is true, this will again be a powerful argument in favour of the Kālaṭi text and for holding that the Cidam. text is a change effected at a later date. Then, it is also possible that at a still later date, some other details also like सर्वज्ञपीठरोहण in Kāśmīra, entering the Dattātreyā Cave in the Himalayan regions etc. were transferred to the life-account of Ādi. Śaṅ., as said by Sri. T. S. N. Śāstri. Swāmi Sakhyānandaji, who had gone through *Śaṅkarendra-Vilāsa*, said to be a biography of Abhi. Śaṅ., holds the same view.

Moreover, if this work of Anantānandagiri were to be taken as a biography of Abhi. Śaṅ., as per the suggestion of Swāmi Tapasyānanda, and

(Continued from the last page)

- (4) राजचूडामणिदीक्षित — कालटि, शिववलीग्रामहार-गोकर्ण-मुकांबिका-अहोबिल-अनन्तशयन-मदुरा-रामसेतु-वृषपर्वत-द्वारका-चिदम्बर-गरुडापगा शोणगिरीशपुरी-सत्यव्रत काञ्ची. Leaps noticeable in Cid. श्रीशैल-जगन्नाथपुरी द्वारका, in Rāja. D. वृषपर्वत-द्वारका-चिदम्बर
- (5) माधव — मध्याजुन-रामेश्वर-काञ्ची-विदर्भराजधानी-कर्नाटक-गोकर्ण-सौराष्ट्र-उज्जयिनी-नैमिष-भद्रेश-वरदकुरुपा-चोलदेश-कामरूप-विदेह-कोसल-वंग-गौड-बदरी-काश्मीर-बदरिकाश्रम-केदार- (सिद्धिस्थान)
- (6) सदानन्द — रामेश्वर-काञ्ची-कर्नाटक-गोकर्ण-द्वारका-उज्जयिनी-कामरूप-काशी-काश्मीर-शृंगेरी-बदरिकाश्रम (सिद्धिस्थान)
- (7) गुरुवंशकाव्य — मध्याजुन-अनन्तशयन-रामेश्वर-तौलनग्राम-रौप्यपीठपुर-गोकर्ण-श्रीशैल-शेषाचल-नारसिंहगिरि-जगन्नाथपुरी-काशी-काश्मीर-शृंगेरी-काञ्ची-बदरिवन-नेपाल-दत्तात्रेयगुहा (सिद्धिस्थान)
- (8) नीलकण्ठ — रामेश्वर-काञ्ची-बराहक्षेत्र-विदर्भ-राजधानी-कर्नाटक-गोकर्ण-द्वारका-उज्जयिनी-कामरूप-काशी-काश्मीर-बदरिकावन (सिद्धिस्थान)

It will be noticed from these lists that neither the places visited by Śaṅ. nor their order seems to be definitely known to the writers while leaps from the North to the South (Kāsh. to Śrī. and back to Badarivara — Sadā., Nīla. and G. F. K.), Vidarbha to Karnatak (Mādhava and Nīlakaṇṭha), Vṛṣapārvata-Dwārakā-Cidambaram (Rāja. D.) and from the East to the West — Dwārakā or Ujjaini to Kāmarūpa i.e. Assam (Nīlakaṇṭha) or from Jagannātha Puri to Ujjain — Cidambara (Cid.) are very clear and are very difficult to account for.

not of Ādi Śaṅ., it need not at all be criticised for giving wrong details about the latter because it is not a Śaṅ. *Vijaya* proper i. e. a biography of Ādi Śaṅ. at all. It is, however, criticised only on the understanding that it is a regular Ś. V. i. e. a biography of Ādi Śaṅ, only and not the biography of any other Śaṅ.

Swāmiji's argument that "many of the copies of both the groups are likely to be copies only and from the numbers, their authenticity cannot be ascertained"¹ cannot be accepted fully. This just looks like a veiled attempt to belittle the importance of the mss. favouring the Kālaṭi text. If mss. of both the groups are likely to be copies, they are on the same level of authenticity and the higher number of mss. of any one particular group is definitely a pointer and their weight cannot be belittled simply by insinuating that many of the mss. are probably copies only, though it may be conceded as a general rule only that the number need not always be regarded as conclusive.

It is for these reasons that it is not possible to endorse or agree with the view of the author of *Kāmakoti-Śatakoṭi* that these stanzas "are newly created by the Kumba-mutt people"² - nay, even that 'the entire Ānandagiriya is a creation by the Kumba-Pandits.'³ The *Advalta Rājya Lakṣmī*, one of the two commentaries on *Sanḥṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya* of Mād. or the *Mādha-vīya*, written in 1824 A. D. says clearly that Anantānandagiri wrote कालव्याख्ये ग्रामवर्णे etc. and hence, it is impossible that the Rāma Tārak Mutt in Banaras could have changed the text of Anantā's Ś. V. in the edition of Jīvānanda Vidyāsagara, by adding the stanzas कालव्याख्ये etc. Moreover, in addition to some m. s. elsewhere, (mentioned in my article in the Bombay University Journal), I have personally seen two mss. of this same work in the Ānandāśrama Library, Pune, which also give the same stanzas, कालव्याख्ये etc. All this cannot be dismissed as the deliberate mischief of the Kumba Mutt. Thus, the whole tirade launched by critics against that mutt and Anantā's work becomes null and void. My contention, as said earlier, is that we have to give due credence and importance to the Kālaṭi-text, which has a larger number of mss. to favour it. We have to recognise it as an important variant with which we have to reckon seriously and not to attribute it to the scheming minds of the Kumba. mutt people.

It is also not possible to agree with the author of *Kāmakoti-Śatakoṭi* that the remaining chapters of the Rāma Tārak Mutt relate the story of

1. Ibid. p. xxxi.

2. Vide *Kāma. Śata.* p. 81 (end),

3. Ibid. p. 86.

Cidam. Śaṅ. only and not that of Ādi Śaṅ. of Kālaṭi.¹ In the first place, which is the story of Cidam. Śaṅ. and where is it found elsewhere so that it could be equated or identified with the story given in these remaining chapters? Neither Swāmiji nor the *Kāma-Śata*. mentions it or even a single incident which can be said to be peculiar to this Cidam. Śaṅ. Secondly, if Śaṅ.'s encounter with Maṇḍana, his परकायाप्रवेश, his having Govindamuni as his master, having Sure., Padma., Hasta. and Totāka as his disciples, establishing a mutt at Śṛṅgerī and starting a Bhārati Pīṭha Paramparā there and so on, are not to be connected with Kālaṭi Śaṅ., to whom are they to be related and what is the evidence for so relating them to some other Śaṅ. ? Thirdly, all the three passages quoted in *Kāma-Śata*.² are found in the Jivānanda's edition of 1886 also and are not peculiar to the Rāma Tārak Mutt text. The word विश्वजित् in the second passage is unnecessarily equated with the name of Śaṅ.'s father, as being different from Śivaguru, thereby suggesting that here, the Mutt-text gives the father's name as in ch. II - the bone of contention. The word विश्वजित् here has nothing to do with Śaṅ.'s father. Lastly Śaṅ.'s going from Cidam. to मध्याहुन and from Cidam. to Garuḍāpagā is found in Cidvilāsa and Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita also respectively.

(2) The other objection against this work of Anantānandagiri is that it is said to contain allusions to Rāmānujācārya and Madhvācārya, the two great philosophers after Śaṅ.³ No one states exactly where the references occur but Mr. R. K. Iyer quotes in this context three passages which are found to belong to Ch. 68 of this work.⁴ The chapter pertains to two disciples of Śaṅ., Lakṣmaṇa and Hastāmālaka, who have been equated by the critics with Rāmā. and Madhvā. Lakṣmaṇa was the younger brother of Śrī Rāma and as such was राम-अनुज = रामानुज. Lakṣmaṇa in this work is said to be an incarnation of or Amśa of the serpent God Śeṣa and so also, रामानुजाचार्य was said to have been an incarnation of Śeṣa. The equation is, therefore, said to be perfect. Secondly, Hastāmālaka is said in this work to have been the incarnation or Amśa of God Vāyu and so was Madhvācārya regarded as an incarnation of Vāyu. Then, again, Hastā. is said here to have established a temple of Lord Kṛṣṇa at रजतपीठ-स्थल and so did Madhvā. establish one at Uḍipi. Thus, this equation also

1. Ibid. p. 82.

2. Ibid. p. 86.

3. Vide (i) *Truth* Pt. I, pp. 37-38; (ii) *Śaṅ.'s Date* Prof. R. M. Umesh, p. 216; (iii) *Ś. V. of Anantā*. — A Review, by Dr. Dakṣiṇāmūṛthy, pp. 4-5. On p. 5, Dr. Dakṣiṇāmūṛthy quotes a similar view of Pandit N. Bhāṣyācārya and Śrī Veṅkaṭarāman, a disciple of the Kumbha Mutt.

4. Vide Bibliotheca Indica Series, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Edn. 1886 A.D.

is said to be complete. Dr. Dakṣiṇāmūrti says : " that the reference is certainly to these Ācāryas is placed beyond doubt by his referring to them as incarnations of Śeṣa and Vāyu resp. and by his saying that the latter established a temple of Śrī Kṛṣṇa at Uḍipi ".¹

Mr. R. K. Iyer says further that it is absurd to say that Rāmā. preached at the instance of Śaṅ. and that Madhva also not only preached but established Śrī Kṛṣṇa at Uḍipi, also at his instance — particularly in view of the fact that both these Ācāryas have been Śaṅ.'s opponents in the philosophical field. According to Mr. Iyer, it is still more absurd to say that Śaṅ. himself made them Sannyāsins and he wonders whether Hastā., who was Śaṅ.'s disciple before Śaṅ. started on his trimphphant tour, remained a bachelor till the end of his life.²

All this criticism is rooted in the supposed identity of Lakṣmaṇa and Hastā. with the two Ācāryas Rāmā. and Madhvā. respectively, which appears to be quite gratuitous. Simply because Lakṣmaṇa is Rāmā. Anuja, the younger brother of Rāmā, it is quite far-fetched to take him to refer to Rāmāyaṇa. If the Rāmāyaṇa is to be believed, Lakṣmaṇa, the brother of Rāmā, was himself regarded as the incarnation of Śeṣa and as such, he has nothing to do with Ācārya Rāmā. Secondly, Hastā. has been said to be an incarnation of Vāyu. in the *San̄kṣepa San̄kara Jaya* of Mādhava i. e. *Mādhaviya* also, where he has been described as the son of Prabhākara.³ Obviously, either Mād. has borrowed the idea from Anantānandagiri or vice versa. Once again, however, this has nothing to do with Ācārya Madhvā., who is also said to be an incarnation of Vāyu.⁴ The expression रजतपीठ-स्थलेषु etc. refers to the establishment of different deities like Kṛṣṇa at different रजतपीठस्थल and not one deity Kṛṣṇa only.

Moreover, Anantānandagiri is not the only person to mention Lakṣmaṇa as the preacher of Vaiṣṇavism, sent out by Śaṅ. The *Guruvam̄sa Kāvya* and the *Mādhaviya* also, both of them Śrī. works, mention Lakṣmaṇa as the person deputed by Śaṅ. to propagate the Vaiṣṇava faith, though it has to be noted that in the case of the *Mādhaviya*, it is its commentator Dhanapatisūrin who actually mentions the name.⁵ However, it is also

1. Vide *Ś. F.* of Anantā — A Review by Dr. Dakṣiṇā, p. 4.

2. Vide *Truth* p. 38.

3. Read : पवनोऽन्यजनि प्रसाकरात् सवनोन्मीलितकीर्तिमण्डलात् ।

गलहस्तिभेदवाचसौ विल हस्तामलकामिधामधात् ॥ *Ś. Ś. Jaya* III. 3.

4. Vide *सुमध्वविजय* by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Pandit, Madhvācārya is called अवतार of वायु.

5. Vide comm. on *Ś. Ś. Jaya* of Mad., XV. 174; comm. on *G. F. K.*, III. 36; and *Ś. F.* of Anantā., Chh. 67-72.

worth noting that all the three Ānantā, Mād. and the author of *G. V. K.* mention the same six cults and their preachers as follows : (1) वैवमत - परमत-कालानल (2) शाक्तमत - त्रिपुराकुमार (3) गानपत्यमत - गिरिजाकुमार (4) वैष्णवमत - लक्ष्मण (5) सौरमत - दिवाकर (6) कापालिकमत - वटुकनाथ. Anantāandagiri is the only writer to add the name of the Vaiṣṇava मत.

When the equations are thus found to be unsustainable, the absurdity of Rāmānuja and Madhva preaching at the instance of Śaṅ., their doctrinal opponent, disappears automatically. If, however, the absurdity is intended to be on account of the historical anachronism involved therein, how very absurd is it to make Śaṅ. argue with persons like Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, Harṣa (author of खण्डनखण्डखाद्य), Abhi. Gupta and Nīlakantha, when the latter three came centuries after Śaṅ.'s latest date 788 A. D. to 820 A. D. and to make Śaṅ. suffer from fistula (Bhagandara-disease) as a result of black magic practised upon him by Abhi. Gupta, at least 250 yrs. after Śaṅ. passed away ! No one raises even a murmur of dissatisfaction about this; on the contrary, this absurdity is sought to be diluted on the ground that the writing is a poetic composition and so on.¹

Then, again, Mr. Iyer's difficulty as to whether Hastāmalaka, who joined Śaṅ. before the latter embarked on his triumphant tour, remained a bachelor only till the end of Śaṅ.'s life, when he was initiated into sannyāsa is not at all appreciated. This work of Anantā. does not give us any information about the antecedents of Hastā. but elsewhere, as in Mādhyama, Sadānanda, K. S. V., Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita, and Cid., he is said to be the son of one दिवाकराश्वरिन् (Cid. XI. 18 to 36), about 12 yrs. (Rāja. D. III. 44) or 13 yrs. (Vyā. XII, Mād. XII. 51, Sadā. XI. 24) and has been described by all as जन्मसिद्ध and averse to any worldly attachment. Śaṅ. actually tells his father that such a boy would be of no use to him and hence should be given over to him (Mād. XII. 59 & 61; K. S. V. VI. 24, 25 etc.).

Secondly, when Śaṅ. was about to get Vārtikas written by Sureśvara on his *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya*, his disciples, who did not approve of the choice of Sureśvara for the purpose, suggested the name of Hastāmalaka in his place but Śaṅ. ruled it out on the ground that, he was निवृत्त or प्रवृत्तिरहित (averse to all extrovert activity) from the very beginning and as such, he could not be made or asked to undertake this activity of extroversion (Mād. XIII. 39, Sadā. XII. 32, 37, Nīla. V. 63). Is such a person also expected to get married at some stage of life? Is it not very natural and more

1. Vide Śaṅ.'s Date Prof. Umesh, p. 218; JSMV p. 193.

consistent that a spiritual genius that he is, he should remain a bachelor not only till the end of Śaṅ.'s life but till the end of his own life also ?

Thirdly, Hastā, originally पृथ्वीधर or पृथ्वीधव, is said to have been the first head of the Śrī. Mutt (Ś. V. of Anantā, Ch. 62, Saṅkeśvara Mutt ms.), where we have a succession of ब्रह्मचारी सन्यासी only. As such also, it is nothing to be wondered that Hastāmalaka was a bachelor till the end of his own life and not till the end of Śaṅ's life only.

That this work of Anantānandagiri on account of its references to the two Ācāryas — Rāmānuja and Madhva of the 11th and 12th cent. A. D. and on account of its quoting from the अधिकरणरत्नमाला of भारतीतीर्थ (14th cent. A. D.) is later than the 14th cent. A. D. (why it is said to be later than Dhanapatisūrin, the commentator of the MādHAVīya, has not been made clear by Mr. Dakṣiṇāmūrthy) is not much of a special argument against the reliability or otherwise thereof because there is hardly any Ś. V. available today, very much prior to the 14th cent. A. D. Some of them are as late as the 19th cent. A. D. (Nīla's Ś. M. S. and Śaṅ. Daya) and 20th cent. A. D. (BhagDaya by Laxmaṇa Śāstrin of Śringerī). MādHAVīya also, even according to Mr. R. G. Śarmā and others, is not earlier than the 14th cent. A. D., though scholars like Prof. B. Upādhyāya of Banaras and the late Śrī. Bālaśāstri Haradāra of Nagpur hold that it must have been written between 1650 A. D. and 1800 A. D.

It has to be noted that while the critics of this work of Anantā. emphasise its textual discrepancies and denounce it as utterly valueless on account of the same, they do not give any credit to the fact that all the mss. of the work without exception — even the printed edition of Jivānanda — 1881 A. D. — state that Śaṅ. passed away at Kāñci in front of the Goddess Kāmākṣī and not at Kedāranātha in the north. On the contrary, they try to find fault with the manner in which the passing away of Śaṅ. has been described by the author.

To conclude, therefore, whatever the value of this work otherwise, the objections raised against it are not tenable and hence, it is not possible to agree with Mr. Iyer that the work is quite unreliable and has to be thrown aside.

Mārkaṇḍeya Saṁhitā

Regarding this work, it appears from what Mr. R. G. Śarmā has said about it that the 'Kumba.' Mutt people refer to it as both Mārka. Purāṇa and Mārka. Saṁhitā. Mr. Śarmā says that the stanzas quoted by the

K. Mutt as from *Mārk. Purāṇa* are identical with those quoted by it as from *Mārk. Saṁhitā*, though with slight variations.¹ *Mārk. Purāṇa* is one of the 18 Purāṇas but Mr. Śarmā tells us that the stanzas quoted by the K. Mutt as from the same were not found by him in any of the 7 copies of that Purāṇa procured by him from six different places nor did he find in the Purāṇa any reference to the story of the Mutt's propaganda.² He also says that this *Mārk. Saṁ.* is not one of the पुराणस or the उपपुराणस.³

The late Paramācārya of the Kāñcī Mutt is reported to have said that the *Mārk. Saṁ.* is a part (3rd Pariskanda) of the ब्रह्माण्डपुराण, wherein the story of Śaṁ. has been given.⁴ Other persons say that the *Mārk. Saṁ.* comprises 7th and 8th Pariskandas of the said Purāṇa. It is, however, not found in the ब्रह्मपुराण, which is available to us so far.⁴ Recently, at the instance of one K. Mutt supporter. I inquired about the *Mārk. Saṁ.* from one scholar (a Śāstrin) at the Adyar library but he also said that he was not aware of the same. My personal on-the-spot attempt to find out the work in the library yielded no better result. Mr. R. K. Iyer remarks, perhaps for this very reason that "the whole work is imaginary."⁶

Lastly, the two stanzas from this *Mārk. Saṁ.* as given by the K. Mutt,⁵ make very queer reading when they say that all the heads of the Kāñcī Pīṭha, and not Ādi Śaṁ. only, deserve to be worshipped not only by the human beings but also by Indra, Brahmā and Viṣṇu and Mr. Iyer is not very much unjustified when he remarks that "it is surprising that the author of such passages did not in the least realise the profanity of such claims."⁷

Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad Dīpikā

This work is available in Ms. form only but it is very sad that the stanzas quoted as from this work in *Suśamā*, while commenting on st. 77 of *G. R. M.* and which contain a reference to the Kāñcī Pīṭha, are not found in the Ms. procured by me from the Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore. Mr. Iyer also says thus : "I have verified that these stanzas are not

1. Vide *JSMV* p. 117.

2. Ibid p. 116.

3. Late Paramācārya's speech at Madras on 1.11.1932, referred to in *JSMV* p. 117 and *Myth* pp. 88-89.

4. Vide *JSMV* p. 117; *Myth* p. 89; *Truth* p. 18.

5. Vide *Truth* p. 18; *Myth* p. 89.

6. *Mārk. Saṁ.* Pariskanda 8, Stt. 3 and 5.

7. Vide *Truth* Pt. I, p. 19.

found in both the mss. I am aware of."¹ It is not clear how Mr. Śarmā says that a Ms. copy of the work is available in the Adyar Mss. Library² because on enquiry with them, I was informed by the said library that they did not have a copy of the same. When I tried to check it up myself from their card-index, I was also not able to find the work among the list of Mss. there.

Yoga-Liṅga

With regard to this Yoga-liṅga, both Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Iyer have raised a number of objections. Particularly, there is a keen controversy regarding the correct word or reading between योगेश्वर and योगेश्वर in नैषधीय चरित XII. 38.³ Supporting authorities in favour of the two views have been cited on both the sides. Mr. Iyer is, however, firm that योगेश्वर is the correct reading and suggests that it can be equated with एकाग्रनाथ in Kāñcī, who is also called योगेश्वर. A little later only, however, he seems not to insist on this equation. His other suggestion is that "Harṣa did not refer to any deity at Kāñcī at all but to a deity nearer home to himself, viz. the Liṅga called योगेश्वर in a famous shrine at a place known as Bala Kailāsa in the Himalayas."⁴ This sudden flight (of imagination) to the Himalayas in the otherwise unmixed Kāñcī setting is, however, not understood. Even like the two critics, however, I too feel that the establishment of this liṅga does not materially bear on or affect either way the establishment or otherwise of a Mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī and hence the topic need not detain us here any more.

Regarding the other works, which are available to day and from which stanzas have been quoted, it has to be admitted that the stanzas quoted in *Susamā* as from *Vyāsācaliṭya* and *K. Ś. V.* or *Ś. Caritām* of Gov., apart from *Br. Up-Dūpika*, are not to be found in the printed editions thereof. Six Mss. of *Vyāya* and 7 different editions of *K. Ś. V.* were consulted for preparing the texts of the two works respectively. By a curious coincidence, most of these stanzas pertain to Śaṅ.'s establishing a Mutt and/or his passing away at Kāñcī.

With regard to passages quoted in *Susamā* as from *Ācārāviṭaya*, it has to be noted that it is the same as the *Ś. V.* of Anantā. Mr. Śarmā once

1. Ibid Pt. I, p. 108.

2. Vide *JSMV* p. 350.

3. For a discussion of this point, vide *Truth* Pt. I, Ch. XIV, pp. 138-143 and *JSMV* Pt. II, Ch. I, pp. 254-257.

4. Vide *Truth* p. 140.

describes *Ācāryavijaya* as a work of unknown time and authorship but immediately thereafter identifies it with the *Ś. V.* of Anantā/Ānanda. The passages quoted in *Suṣamā* on st. 14 and st. 15 of *Gururatanmālīkā* are present in the *Ānanda.ya/Anantā.ya* while the passages found in this work, pertaining to the establishment of a Mutt at Kāñcī are not found anywhere in *Suṣamā*.¹

Guru-Paramparā

According to the K. Mutt, *Puṇyaśloka-māñjarī* proper was prepared from the 1st Ācārya upto Ācārya Candracūḍa, No. 55 by सर्वज्ञसदाबोध, No. 56 (1512 to 1539 A. D.). The list was continued upto Ācārya Ātmaprakāśa, No. 60 by one Ātmabodha, the disciple of Mahādeva Sarasvatī, No. 61 (1704 to 1746 A. D.), who was himself the disciple of Ātmaprakāśa, No. 60 (1692 to 1704 A. D.). From Ācārya Mahādeva Sarasvatī, No. 61 (1704 to 1746 A. D.) to Mahādeva Sarasvatī (1909 A. D. 6 days only), No. 67, the list was prepared by one Polagām Rāmsāstri. This last, No. 67 and Condraśekhara Sarasvatī, No. 68 (Paramācārya) were covered by Sri Jayendra Sarasvatī, No. 69, the present reigning Ācārya of the K. Mutt. The list from 56 to 60 is called *P. Ś. M. Parīṣiṣṭa*, Part I and the one from No. 61 to 67 is called *P. Ś. M. Parī*, Part II.

G. R. M. has been attributed by the K. Mutt. to Sadā. Brahmedra, the disciple of Parama. Śivendra (1539 to 1586 A. D.) and co-student of Ātmabodhendra, also the disciple of Parama. Śivendra. The time of Ātma. comes to 1586 to 1638 A. D. Sadā. Brah. is said to have written G. R. M. at the instance of Ātma., who must, therefore, have been his contemporary. The G. R. M. covers Ācāryas upto Paramaśiva, No. 57.

According to the concluding stanzas of *Suṣamā* it was written in 1720 A. D., by Ātma. disciple of Mahā. Saras. and in *P. Ś. M. Parī*, Part II, we are told in the Vṛtti on the very stanza that it was during the reign of Ācārya Mahā. Saras. No. 61 that Ātmabodha wrote *Suṣamā*, the commentary on G. R. M. *Suṣamā* and covers Ācāryas Ātmabodha, Bhagavannāmbodha and Ātmaprakāśa, No. 53, 59 and 69 i. e. upto 1704 A. D. also.

From all this account, it appears that both *P. Ś. M.*, Part I and *Suṣamā* were written by one and the same person named Ātmabodha or by two persons bearing the same name Ātma. The second of these alternatives is open to certain objections, as follows :

1. These passages pertain to what the critics (of the Kāñcī Mutt) describe as the embellished (परिष्कृत) edition of *Ś. V.* of Anantā.

Firstly, we find that there is only one Ātmabodha in the list of K. Mutt Ācāryas, particularly after Ācārya Candracūḍa, No. 55. This Ātmabodha is, however, the disciple of Parama-śivendra (1539-1586 A. D.) and not of Mahā. Saras. (1704-1746 A. D.), who was himself the disciple of Ātmaprakāśa (1692-1704 A. D.), as said in the colophon of *P. Ś. M. Pari*, Part. I, of which he is said to be the author. Only if he is the disciple of Parama Śivendra, he could be a costudent of Sadā. Brah., who is said to have belonged to the 17th cent. A. D. and written *G. R. M.* at the instance of Ātmabodha. If Ātmabodha, the author of *P. Ś. M. Pari*, Part. I. (upto Ācārya No. 60) is to have been the disciple of Ācārya Mahā. Saras., the disciple of Ātmaprakāśa (No. 60), he must be the same as Ācārya Candrasekhara, No. 62, who follows Mahā. (No. 61)¹ and is his disciple. There is no suggestion to this effect anywhere in K. Mutt literature, available to me so far.

Now, *Suśamā*, commentary on *G. R. M.*, is said to have been written in Śaka 1642 = 1720 A. D. and this tallies with the Vṛtti on st. 1 of *P. Ś. M. Pari*, Part. II, pertaining to Ācārya Mahā. Saras. No. 61, who occupied the seat of the K. Mutt from 1704-1746, and during whose reign Ātmabodha is said to have written *Suśamā*. It cannot tally with Ācārya Atma. No. 58, the disciple of Parama Śiva (No. 57), both of whom belong to the 16th / 17th cent. A. D. We have, therefore, to assume that he must be some other person named Ātmabodha and he could be the same as Candrasekhara, No. 62, and as there is no second Ācārya Ātmabodha in the K. Mutt list, he could not have been any Ācārya of that Mutt. In that case, it is not clear how he describes himself as आत्मबोधेन्द्रसरस्वती. Only with a second Ātmabodha, who was not an Ācārya of the K. Mutt, can we reconcile his being a disciple of Mahā. Saras. (No. 61), the disciple of Ātmaprakāśa (No. 60) and his writing *Suśamā* in 1720 A. D. This can also explain how and why this Ātmabodha covers the three Ācāryas 58, 59, 60 in the *P. Ś. M. Pari*, Part. I. If, on the contrary, he were the same as Ātmabodha, Ācārya No. 58, how could he have covered these three Ācāryas of which he is the first and the other two his successors? And still, though his being a disciple of Mahā. Saras., during whose reign he is said to have written his *Suśamā*, can be understood, his reference to himself as आत्मबोधेन्द्र सरस्वती, which suggests his being one, is not explained. In all, all this tangle about the authorship of *P. Ś. M. Pari*, Part. I and *Suśamā* being attributed to Ātmabodha remains unsolved at least for me.

1. Vide जगद्गुरूपरम्परास्तवस्तोत्र Stt. 62-64 and जगद्गुरूपरंजनाममाला Stt. 20-21.

Two or three more points about this list of K. Mutt Ācāryas may be noted :

(1) Neither *P. Ś. M.* with its *Parīṣiṣṭas*, nor जगद्गुरुरम्परानाममाला both giving the list of K. Mutt Ācāryas and written by Ācārya Mahā. / Sudarśana (No. 65) nor even *G. R. M.* and *Suṣamā* describe *Sadā. Brah.*, the author of *G. R. M.* as having been an Ācārya of the K. Mutt. Mr. T. S. Nārāyaṇa Śāstri, however, mentions him as Ācārya No. 57, as a disciple of Parama. Śiva, whom he gives as Ācārya No. 56. In that case, he becomes identical with विद्याविकासबोधेन्द्रसरस्वती. No. 58, said by all the above authorities to have succeeded परमशिवेन्द्र.

(2) There is a very slight variation in the total number of the Ācāryas of the K. Mutt, the variation being to the extent of one or two only.

(3) The stanza अतिबाल्यविद्वत्संयम etc., which refers to Śrī Candrasekharendra Saras. (the late Paramācārya) has been written by Sri Jayendra Saras. Swamigal, the present reigning Ācārya of the K. Mutt. Mr. Śarmā, however, takes it to have been written by Ācārya No. 56 who wrote the *P. Ś. M.* proper i. e. upto and inclusive of Ācārya Candracūḍa. No. 55, when Paramācārya was not even born, (he was born in 1894 A. D.) and has advanced this as an argument to show that *P. Ś. M.* is not genuine and hence is not reliable.

His other objection also regarding the form in which the *Punyaślokas*, representing the history of the mutt lay scattered over a period of about or over 2000 years can, in a way, apply to the *Guru-paramparās* of the other Mutts also. Regarding Śringeri Mutt, *G. V. K.* seems to be the first account of the *Guru-paramparā* of that Mutt and the copy of the Śrī. list found in the Pūjā-box of Śrī Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī Swāmī seems to have been based on the one given in *G. V. K.*, which is said to have been written about 1735 A. D.¹ Beyond that the work was written at the instance of the then ruling Ācārya Śrī Saccidānanda Bhāratī Swāmī, and that he is following poets like Ānandagiri (I. 6 : comm.), who are said to have described the *Paramparā* of the Ācāryas, nothing is known or can be ascertained about the source or basis of *G. V. K.* Similarly, the list of the Ācāryas of the Dwārakā mutt is given in the book *Vimarśa* said to have been written by one of its Ācāryas, viz. Śrī Rājarājesvara Śaṅkarāśrama Swāmī and published 1955 A. D. Regarding the Govardhana Mutt at Puri, we know nothing beyond the list of about 144 Ācāryas of that

1. Vide *G. V. K.* (1966 Edn.), Preface p.1 (para.1), Vanī Vilas Press.

Mutt supplied by them. Even this much definite information is not available about the Jyotir Mutt in the North. What Prof. Umesh says about the Puri Mutt list viz. that "analysis of the Guruparamparā was hardly possible since details of the lives of the pontiffs were not furnished ..." ¹ is more or less, applicable to the three mutts viz. Dwārakā, Jyotir and Puri. All this means that flaws or irregularities in the Guruparamparā of a Mutt are not by themselves sufficient to disprove the validity or existence of any mutt.

The contention of the critics, however, about the non-existence of anything like a Kāñci Kāma Koṭi Mutt, the Kumba mutt only being what exists as a fact can be countered only by showing that such a Kāñci Mutt did exist prior to the 18th cent. A. D. The other objections to the list of such a Mutt raised by the supporters of the said mutt also need to be answered sufficiently satisfactorily but sadly, no serious attempt, except the production of some copper-plate grants, has so far been made by these supporters, beyond bringing out some new books and pamphlets from time to time, with the same old quotations from "authorities", which they are reliably believed to possess and are known equally reliably to have shown to certain persons but which they have refused to bring forward inspite of repeated requests by other serious minded persons to do so. Till such time as more convincing and even conclusive evidence comes forward, the following points may be noted.

(1) Regarding the K. Mutt list pre-dating Śaṅ. by putting him in the 6th/5th cent. B. C., this is true of all the other 4 Mutts also. The Dwārakā Mutt has 75/76 Ācāryās and the regnal periods assigned to them take Śaṅ. back to the 6th/5th cent. B. C. ² The copper-plate of king Sudhanvan, mentioned in *Vimarśa*, agrees with this dating. ³

The Jyotir Mutt in the Himalayas was till recently considered to be almost a defunct one but the present Ācārya of the Dwārakā mutt, who is said to be the Ācārya of the Jyotir Mutt also, gave me (in 1987) a list of 82 Ācāryas of the latter mutt. Even granting 20 or 25 years to each Ācāryas, Śaṅ. will have to be placed in the 4th cent. A. D. or in the 1st cent. B. C.

The Govardhana mutt at Puri has a clear list of over 144 Ācārya and even granting 20 years to an Ācārya, Śaṅ. will go back to the 9th cent.

1. Vide *Śaṅ.'s Date* Prof. Umesh, p. 133.

2. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. & Śaṅ. ite Insti.* Sri Ananta. Saras., pp. 76-78; with Śaṅ., the total number of Ācāryas is 76 and without Śaṅ. it will be 75.

3. Vide *Vimarśa* pp. 31/22. The copper-plate is dated युधिष्ठिर शक 2663, which is said to correspond to 476 B. C.

B. C. In the absence of the regnal periods of these Ācāryas, nothing can be said beyond this about the list.

Śringerī Mutt has so far the smallest number of Ācāryas, 34 or 35, upto 1989 A. D. . There is strong evidence that, at least at one time or even till recently, that Mutt held that Śaṅ. belonged to the 1st cent. B. C. (44 B. C. to 12 B. C.), whatever any person may now say to the contrary. In this connection, the following points may be noted.

(1) Śrī Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī VIII (1817 A. D. to 1879 A. D.) is said to have prepared the list of Śrī. Mutt Ācāryas about 1875 A. D. His successor, Śrī Śivābhinava Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī (1868 A. D. to 1912 A. D.) told Mr. R. N. Ghose that his Guru constructed the list at the instance of archaeologists and that Śaṅ.'s birth date was given therein as Vikrama Samvat 14 and that Śaṅ.'s successor Sure. was stated to have lived as the head of the Mutt for 800 years till 757 A. D. He added, "you may take it as true or false as you like." The list prepared by Śrī Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī Swāmī was said to have been kept by him in his Pūjā Box.¹

(2) Mr. Rice, who personally believed that Śaṅ. was born in 737 A. D., also says that preceding dates were referred to Vikrama Era, 14th year as the date of Śaṅ.'s birth and that Sure. held his authority for 800 years. He says further that there are records in the Śrī. Mutt to this effect.²

(3) Nārāyaṇa Śrinivāsa Rāja Purohit wrote a biography of Sure. in Canarese, to which Śrī Chadraśekhara Bhāratī of Śringerī gave a Śrīmuḥa. Therein, Mr. Śrinivāsa says that when he approached the said Swāmiji, the latter told him that Sure. lived so long because he was a yogin. This means that according to Śrī Chandra. Bhāratī also, Śaṅ. belonged to the 1st cent. B. C.³

(4) While reviewing Mr. K. S. Rāmaswāmy Śāstrī's book "Śaṅkarācārya," the reviewer compliments the writer on choosing 509 B. C. as the most likely of the many dates and then says that "he need not have ... put forth alternate date 44 B. C. of the Śringerī Mutt as the date of Śaṅ.'s birth, in spite of the Paramaguru of the present Śringerī head saying that according to him, Guru Śaṅ. was born in 44 B. C."⁴

(5) Dr. Jadunath Sarkar clearly refers to the long life of 800 years attributed to Sure. and also to the defence that this is obviously due to

1. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. & Śaṅ. ite Insti.* by Sri Ananta. Saras. p.108.

2-3. Ibid p.101.

4. Ibid pp.103/4.

the destruction of old records, leading to the loss of the names of the successors of Sure. till 757 A. D. He, therefore, distrusts the list of Gurus of the Śrī. Gurus upto 757 A. D., just as the critics of the K. Mutt distrust their list upto 1700 A. D.¹

(6) A plaque on one of the 4 sides of the Samādhi structure of Āryāmbā, Śaṅ.'s mother, at Ka'ati contained some stanzas engraved therein, the first of which stated clearly that Śaṅ. flourished some 2000 years prior to 1910 A. D.² when the renovation of the whole place took place and the Samādhi structure was put up. This clear statement cannot be diluted to mean "several centuries ago" or "long back and nothing more."³ Almost an identical statement occurs in *Śaṅkara Digvijaya Sāra* of Sadānanda.⁴

(7) In the plaint in the suit of the year 1844 A. D., the plaintiff, the Śrī. Mutt, had said that it was Ādi Śaṅ. who first performed the Tātanka-Pratiṣṭhā some 1700 years ago. This means that according to the Śrī. mutt, ... Śaṅ.'s date cannot be 788 A. D., at least at that time.⁵

(8) Lastly, when I met H-H. Śrī Mahāsannidhānam at Kālādī in 1958 A. D. for the first time, he also held the view that Śaṅ. belonged to the 1st cent. B. C. and all our conversation proceeded on that basis.

From all this, it is clear that at least at one time, the Śrī. Mutt believed or held the view that Śaṅ. flourished in the 1st cent. B. C. and that it is not that only the disciples of the Kumbha. Kāñci Mutt that have put forth different versions regarding Śaṅ.'s date.⁶ Mr. R. G. Śarmā and others like Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa now say that Vikrama Samvat 14 was wrongly referred to the era believed to have been started by king Vikramāditya in 57/58 B. C. but that it actually pertained to Cālukya Vikrama, son of Pulakeśin II, who reigned during 7th/8th cent. A. D.⁷

1. Vide *A history of Daśanāmī Nāda Sannyāsis* by Dr. Jadunath Sarkar, p. 22.

2. Read : प्रायशो वर्षसाहस्रदितयात्प्राक्सदाशिवः । दृष्ट्वाऽधर्मेण धर्मस्य ग्लानिं सर्वत्र भूतले ॥

कालटयां केरले श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यसंज्ञया । प्राप्य जन्म स्वप्रतिज्ञापालनार्थमिवावरात् ॥

Quoted in (i) *Kālādī* by Śrī K. R. Veṅkaṭaraman, Sanskrit Section pp. 1-2;

(ii) *The Śrī. Mutt : A Research Study* by Śrī B. Krishnan, p. 5.

I had also seen and noted down stanzas along with the others (all quoted by Śrī Krishnan) when I visited Kālādī in 1958 A. D.

3. Vide *Śārada and Śaṅ. at Śrī* by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā. p. 8.

4. Read : धर्मे द्वाविंशतिशके सप्तशदिसहस्रके । अब्दे सर्वजिते जातः सहे वै पंचमे दिने ॥ *Śaṅ. Dig. Sāra* by Sadānanda II : 35.

5. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. ya and Śaṅite Insti.* by Śrī Ananta Saras. p. 142.

6. Vide *Śārada and Śaṅ. at Śrī* by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā. p. 10 (bottom).

7. Ibid p. 7; *JSMV* p. 379 and *Myth* p. 29.

Prof. Umesh also has set aside the argument that the Śāñ. Mutt accepted the 1st cent. B. C. as the date of Śāñ., just because someone claims that Śāñ. was born in the 1st cent. B. C. He firmly maintains that the Śrī. Mutt has denied the Mutt's acceptance of the 1st cent. B. C. as the date of Śāñ. and that that can never become the official view of the Śrī. Mutt.¹ Even though we may concede that this represents their present official view, it cannot, I think, be denied that the 1st cent. B. C. was their equally official view earlier, for the many pieces of evidence adduced already. The heads of the Śrī. Mutt itself have said so clearly and they cannot be described or dismissed as "just someone." In this connection, it has to be noted that there is no harm, or nothing objectionable, in changing one's view particularly in matters of historical facts in the light of new evidence coming forth in the meantime, but in this particular case, to say "that Śāñ. was never placed in B. C. by the Śrīgerī Mutt"² is not in keeping with facts. The Śrī. Mutt has now removed the plaque from Samādhi structure of Āryāmbā at Kālaṭi.

Here, another difficulty arises :

Both Mr. R. G. Śarmā and Prof. Umesh hold that Śāñ. has to be put in about 683/4 A. D.,³ i. e. about 100 years earlier than the generally accepted date and now the official date also of the Śrīgerī Mutt, viz. 788 A. D. This date has been accepted in their three publications at least, viz. (i) *Śrīgerī* (p. 8), (ii) *Greatness of Śrīgerī* 1991 A. D. Edition (p. 123) and (iii) *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom* 1990 Edn (p. 10). Firstly this date (683/4 A. D.) will set aside those stanzas, which specifically mention 788 A. D. as the date of Śāñ. as also the official date of the Śrī. Mutt.

Secondly — according to the Śrī. authorities, old as well as new—, Sureśvara, the direct disciple and also the immediate successor of Śāñ. at Śrīgerī, belongs to the end of the 8th cent. A. D. If, however, Śāñ. is taken 100 years earlier, Sure. also will have to be shifted back accordingly. Otherwise, he will have to be kept alive for about 150 years and even more and that will again have to be explained. With Sure thus shifted

1. Vide *Śāñ.'s Date* Prof. R. M. Umesh, p. 199.

2. Vide (i) *Śāradā and Śāñ. at Śrī. Śāñ.'s* by Śrī Śāñ. Nārā. p. 8 (last line); (ii) *Śāñ.'s Date* by Prof. R. M. Umesh, p. 199. Prof. Umesh, holds that the Śrī. Mutt never held the 1st cent. B. C. as the date of Śāñ. because its authorities have been repeatedly denying that according to its tradition, Śāñ. was born roughly in the 1st cent. B. C.

3. Vide *Śāñ.'s Date* by Prof. Umesh, pp. 271-272; *JSMF* p. 27 (top); *Myth* p. 31 and also p. 29.

earlier, the regnal periods of all the subsequent Ācāryas will also have to be shifted accordingly. With the dates of Śrī Vidyātīrthā, Śrī Bhārati Tīrtha and Śrī Vidyāranya Muni fixed beyond doubt, a gap will be created prior to Śrī Vidyātīrtha, which will then be required to be filled up somehow. And, then, all this will have to be reasonably accounted for and explained. Neither Mr. Śarmā nor Prof. Umesh has tried to do so.

Mr. R. K. Iyer, in 'Greatness of Śringerī' (1951 A. D. Edn.) seems to fight shy of expressing even a provisional opinion about the date of Śaṅ. and omits it altogether while giving the Guruparamparā of Śaṅ. Mutt at the end of that book. Regarding Sureśvara, however, he gives 773 A. D. as the year of his passing away (Siddhi),¹ which creates other difficulties.

Firstly, this puts Śaṅ. somewhere in or near the close of the 1st half of the 8th cent. A. D., assigned to him by Mr. Śarmā and Prof. Umesh, both of them being staunch adherents of the Śrī. Mutt, though not necessarily their official spokesmen. The successor of Sure., Nityabodhaghana, is said by Mr. Iyer to have reigned as the head of the Śrī. Mutt for 75 years, from 773 A. D. to 848 A. D. He is said to have become a Sannyāsin in 757 A. D., which means that he must have been born in about 740 or 745 A. D. His age, in that case, comes close to 100 years or even a little more and then he becomes a contemporary, more or less, of Śaṅ. himself. Perhaps, with a view to removing these anomalies, the same book *Greatness of Śringerī*, now published (1991 A. D.) by Tattvāloka with substantial additions and even changes in its 1951 Edn. has revised the date of Śaṅ.'s passing away (Videhamukti) as 820 A. D. (the span of his life has actually been given as 788 A. D. to 820 A. D.,² and 820-834 A. D. as the period of reign of Sure.).³ The regnal period of Sure's successor, Nityabodhaghana, has been reduced from 75 years to 14 years only (834-848 A. D.).⁴ The book *Śringerī*, also published by Tattvāloka (some time after 1977 — see p. 17), gives the span of Śaṅ.'s life as 788-820 A. D. but 813-834 A. D. as the regnal period of Sure. as the head of the Śrī. Mutt. None of these books gives any clue as to the source or basis of all these variations in the dates of Śaṅ. and Sure. in particular.

Curiously enough, 788 A. D. has been given in *Śringerī* as the date of Śaṅ.'s Sannyāsa while the date of Sure's Sannyāsa has been given as 813 A. D. If 788 A. D. is the date of Śaṅ.'s birth, it will mean that Śaṅ. initiated Sure. into Sannyāsa when he i. e. Śaṅ. was 25 years old. Now, accord-

1. Vide *Greatness of Śringerī* (1951 Edn.) by Sri R. K. Iyer p. 78.

2. See Publisher's note p. 4.

3-4. Ibid p. 123.

ing to the Śrī. tradition, Śaṅ. stayed at Śrī. as its first Ācārya for a period of 12 years, before he went to the north and finally disappeared in the Himalayas. Śaṅ. is said to have established his mutt at Śrī. long after his discussion with Maṇḍana, which, even according to Mādhava, Sadānanda and others, had taken place between Śaṅ.'s age of 16 and 20 years i. e. about 805 A. D. Maṇḍana was made a Sannyāsin almost immediately after this discussion, in which he was defeated by Śaṅ., i. e. in about 805 A. D. But this conflicts with 813 A. D. as the date of Sureśvara's Sannyāsa.

The book *Throne of Transcendental Wisdom* does not specify any date for Śaṅ. but it seems to favour 788-820 A. D. as his life-span¹ Upto Śrī Vidyātirtha, it gives no timings of the heads of the Śrī. mutt. It gives 1228-1333 A. D. (105 years) as the regnal period of Śrī Vidyātirtha and remarks that the 4 preceding Ācāryas — No. 6 to 9 — must have reigned from late 11th upto the beginning of the 13th cent. A. D. This means that the 4 Ācāryas from Sureśvara i. e. No. 2 to Jñānottama, No. 5, must have reigned from 820 A. D. to about 1075 A. D. All this shows that the Śrīgerī people have been shifting the dates of its pontiffs just like that of Śaṅ. without indicating any source or producing any evidence for it, leading to chronological difficulties in the process.

Similarly, there are discrepancies — some minor and some major — in the Guruparamparā of the Śrīgerī Mutt. The minor ones are :

(i) The head of both Kūḍali Śrī. and Tuṅgā Śrī. mutt has sometimes been mentioned as पृथ्वीधर.² The मठास्नान्यस्तोत्र mentions the first head as Sure. while गुरुपरम्परास्तोत्र, mentions him as Viśva. Both मठास्तोत्र and गुरुस्तोत्र, however, seem to identify Sure. and Viśva as one person only since they uniformly describe him as चार्तिककार of Śaṅ.'s (Upaniṣad). Bhāṣyas, which term applies to one person only, viz. Sure. It is, however, difficult to see how Sure., who was a गृहस्थसंन्यासी, could ever become the head of the Śrī. Mutt, which has a Guru-paramparā of ब्रह्मचारी संन्यासी only.

(ii) I have gone through and compared 6 lists of the heads of the Śrī. Mutt³ and have found that except for the last one given by Mr. Surya

1. Vide *The Throne* by Śrī K. R. Veṅkaṭaraman, 1990, p. 10.

2. Vide (i) *Śrī Śaṅ.ya & Śaṅ.ite Insti.* by Sri Anantā. Saras. p.98.

and (ii) *Śaṅ.ya & his Sampradāya* (Marathi) by Mr. Bodas मठास्नान्यस्तोत्र for Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt list; and Hultzsch Ms; (गुरुपरम्परास्तोत्र) and गुरुपरम्परानाममाला for the Kūḍali Mutt list, Stt. 5-6, resp.

3. The lists are :

(i) *Śrī Śaṅ.ya & his Sampradāya* by Mr. Bodas, M. pp. 91-94;

(Continued on the next page)

Rao, which ends with the 33rd Ācārya, in all the first five, the total number of Ācāryas from Ādi. Śān. upto the present reigning Swamiji of the Mutt, H. H. Śrī Bhārati Tīrtha, remains constant, i. e. 36 only. It may even be said that but for some minor variations, there is almost complete agreement among the first 5 lists. And yet some variations can be noted: These variations occur after Ācārya No. 14 (नृसिंहभारती I) upto Ācārya No. 22 (नृ० भा० VIII or VII inclusive) and regarding Ācārya No. 34 (चन्द्रशेखरभारती III or IV). These variations are found in the bare lists given in the two books containing the गुरुपरम्परास्तोत्र and मठान्नायस्तोत्र each of the Śrīn. Mutt and in the list given by Mr. Surya Rao.

With regard to the list, the variations pertain to two Ācāryas in particular, viz. चन्द्रशेखरभारती and नृसिंहभारती. Particularly, in the 1975 edition of गुरु० स्तोत्र and मठ० स्तोत्र, the bare list has 4 चन्द्रशेखरभारतीs and 7 नृसिंहभारतीs, one चन्द्र० भा० II being added between नृ० भा० I and पुरुषो० भा० I while in the गुरु० स्तोत्र, we have 3 चन्द्र० भा०s and 8 नृ० भा०s. Then, in both the lists in the two books, नृ० भा० VII in the गुरु० स्तोत्र becomes अभि० नृ० भा० II while naturally enough, नृ० भा० VIII in the गुरु० स्तोत्र० becomes नृ० भा० VII in the lists.

Kāśī Śeṣa Venkṭacāla Śāstrī (Mysore Palace Pandit), in his F. N. on p. 27 in his Bhūmikā to Śān.'s *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya*, points out that the 16th Ācārya of the Śrīn. Mutt has been given as Śān.¹ (शङ्कराख्यगुरु — st. 27, 1975 Edn.). In the bare lists in the two books, (गुरु० स्तोत्र — 1956 and 1975 Editions) however, the name has been given as शङ्करानन्द while it is given as शङ्करभारती also. It, however, seems clear that throughout, Ācārya Śaṅkarānanda only is meant.

Perhaps, it has been given in the गुरु० स्तोत्र as शङ्कराख्य गुरु to suit the metre, even though the writer could also have said शङ्करानन्दमाश्रये (It may be noted that the names of all the Ācāryas have been given in the singular only). Anyway, this cannot be called a variation proper.

Mr. Surya Rao's list has some more variations after Ācārya No. 24. Thus it has 3 अभिनवसच्चिदानन्दभारतीs (No. 25, 28 and 31) in place of 2 only

(Continued from the last page)

- (ii) *Age of Śrīn.* by Śrī T. S. Nārā. Śāstrī, pp. 200-201;
- (iii) *Greatness of Śān.* (1951 Edn.) pp. 78-79 and 1991 Edn. p. 123;
- (iv) *गुरुपरम्परास्तोत्र* Pub. by Vanī-Vilasa Press, Śrīraṅgam, 1975;
- (v) *Śrīngerī* about 1970 — thjs book mostly follows, *Throne* (1990);
- (vi) List given Śrī by B. Surya. Row as given in *Śrī Śān. ya etc.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. 1981, pp. 105-106.

1. Vide *The Śrīn. Māṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, 1991, p. 9.

in the other 5 lists (Nos. 28 and 31) and 2 अभि० नृ० भारती (Nos. 24 and 29) in place of one अभि० नृ० भा० only (No. 24 only), while its Ācārya No. 23 is इमादिनृ० भा० in place of नृ० भा० V in other lists. Thus, with one अभि० नृ० भा० and इमादिनृ० भा०, the number of नृ० भा०s proper in Mr. Rao's list becomes 6 only as against 8 in the other 5 lists. Perhaps, in this list इमादिनृ० भा० is the omission mentioned by Kāñi. Śeṣa V. Sāstri in the list contained in the अष्टोत्तरशतस्तोत्र by Kṛṣṇarāja Wodeyār, who is likely to have followed the other lists and not that given by Mr. Surya Rao.

Lastly, in the पुष्पगिरिमठान्नाय, found in Sri K. V. Pantalu's book *Śaṅkara Maṭha Tattva Prakāśikā* (= *ŚMTP*), some Ācāryas after Vidyāranya bear the affix (*yogapaṭṭaka*) इन्द्रसरस्वती (नृसिंहन्द्रसरस्वती — stt. 18, 20) and so do those of the विरूपाक्षमठ also (शङ्करेन्द्रसरस्वती st. 19).

Now, we come to the major variations :

(1) In an incomplete list of the Heads of the Śringerī Mutt published by Sri K. V. Pantalu, a staunch adherent of that mutt, in his book *ŚMTP* (p. 32), firstly we find that the list begins with Sure. and not Śaṅ. and secondly that the names of seven heads after Sure. are all different from the names found in the other lists of that Mutt. The seven names are : (1) सदानन्द सरस्वती, (2) आनन्द गिरीन्द्र, (3) नरसिंहन्द्र, (4) वासुदेव सुरेन्द्र, (5) कृष्णानन्द सरस्वती (6) नरसिंहन्द्रनाथ, and (7) कृष्णतीर्थ.¹

(2) In *Gadyāvali*, a work on 'Tantric rituals' or dealing with 'Devī worship', written by one निजात्मप्रकाशयोगीन्द्र, we find a list of heads connected with the Tuṅgā Śringerī Mutt as follows : (1) 1 to 11 — Śaṅ., 'बोधधन, ज्ञानधन, ज्ञानोत्तम शिव, ज्ञानगिरि, सिंहगिरि, ईश्वरतीर्थ, नरसिंहतीर्थ, गिरिजातीर्थ, भारतीतीर्थ and विद्यारण्य. (2) 12 to 22 — मलयेन्द्रदेव तीर्थ सरस्वती, यादवेन्द्रसरस्वती, सरस्वती, नरसिंहसरस्वती, महेन्द्रसरस्वती, मल्लिकार्जुन योगेन्द्र, राघव, दयेन्द्रयति, राजानंदतीर्थ, विद्वानन्द, आनन्दचित्प्रकाशबिम्ब.²

In the first group, we find that Sureśvara has been omitted altogether while Vidyātīrtha has been replaced by गिरिजातीर्थ. The second group contains the names, quite foreign to the list of the heads of the Śrī. Mutt. This variation is sought to be explained by saying that the author of *Gadyāvali*, viz. निजात्मप्रकाश, traces his lineage to one मलयानन्द, who was himself initiated into Śrīvidyā Upāsanā by Vidyāranya of Śringerī and hence the list contains the names of Śringerī Ācāryas upto Vidyāranya and then

1. Ibid p. 9 (H). and *Śrī Śaṅ. ya etc.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. pp. 107.

2. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. ya and Śaṅ. ite Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. p. 107; and *The Śringerī Maṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, p. 10.

continues upto the author's own direct Guru आनन्दविद्यतिबिम्ब.¹ The contention here is that the implication that मलयानन्द was also the head of the Śrī. Mutt after Vidyāraṇya and the subsequent list also upto आनन्दविद् pertained to the heads of the Śrī. Mutt is untenable. If, however, this were so, why was the list of the Śrī. Gurus given upto Vidyāraṇya, and then, why was the subsequent list given in continuation thereof? The more natural and proper way would have been to mention Vidyāraṇya, a head of the Śrī. Mutt as the person who initiated the line of श्रीविद्याउपासक from मलयानन्द onwards and then to give the list upto the author's own direct Guru. There should — nay ought to have been — some indication to show or suggest that the list from मलयानन्द onwards had nothing to do with the earlier or any list of heads of the Śrī. Mutt. In the absence of any such indication, there is sufficient room for connecting the two lists with the Ācāryas of the Śrī. Mutt. Moreover, the omission of Sureśvara and replacement of Vidyāūrtha by Gīrijāūrtha have not been explained by the critic. Thirdly, the difference in the names of 7 heads of Śrī. Mutt after Sureśvara in the earlier case (ŚMTP — list) is another instance of such a major variation, for which no such explanation can be or has even been attempted to be given. Whether or not Śrīgerī was so named after Śrīgerī, the other name of मलयानन्द or मलयब्रह्म or मलयेन्द्र is not very material to the present question of variations in the Śrī. Mutt. lists of heads. At best, it is just a hypothetical suggestion, which may or may not be finally true. The very close connection of Śrīgin or मलयब्रह्म with the Śrī. Mutt is, however, borne out sufficiently clearly by the information available in the matter. Thus, a temple stands in front of the Śrī. Mutt at Śrīgerī, containing the figure of Malayā Brahma. At Puṣpagiri Maṭha again, a branch of the Śrī. Mutt, worship to Malayāla Brahmendra is performed on the 12th Bahula day of Phālguna every year, on the lines of the worship to the preceptor i. e. Guru of the presiding head of the mutt. It is needless to multiply such evidence.²

(3) Lastly, in O. S. No. 93 of 1841, in the file of the court of the Principal Sadar Aman, Trichinopoly, filed by the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt, the plaint stated that there were in the Paramparā of that Mutt, 68 Ācāryas and the worship was being performed to them in the Adhiṣṭhānas. According to the currently available गुरुपरम्परा of that Mutt, there could have been 31 or 32 Ācāryas only upto 1844 A. D.

1. Vide *Śārada and Śaṅ. at Śrī. by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā*, pp. 12-13.

2. For more information on this point, vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, pp. 11-12.

This again is sought to be explained by saying that it was just a slip on the part of "a simple person as a Josyar who represented the Śringerī Mutt at Tiruchirappalli while instructing the advocate at Tiru. who may not be acquainted with the history of the पूर्वचार्य of the Maṭha".¹ That such an argument should at all have been advanced by a serious-minded critic is indeed very surprising. The slips of Mr. Krishnan, pointed out by the critics are not substantial or material and do not harm his argument in any way. But as remarked by Śrī Anantā. Saras., "the statement made in the plaint should have been a sworn statement" and hence a very material one, and as such, it ought to have been made with great circumspection, as it was likely to affect the general position of the Śringerī Maṭha. Hence, if this was 'a slip', it reflects very badly indeed on both — the Mutt-representative and the advocate. Moreover, this fact of variation has also been pointed out by Śrī Anantā. Saras. who, however, has not been guilty of any such 'slip'. Lastly, it has also to be noted that even though a lot of literature on this controversy between the two mutts — K. K. Mutt to the Śringerī Mutt — is being brought out by the supporters of the latter and even though this particular point was made out by Śrī Anantā. Saras. as far back as 1982, no explanation of any kind has been sought to be given so far. Even then, it need not be said that this one single dissident case, quite noteworthy as it is, should be given such an importance that it may override the general consensus of all the other lists, which give a more or less uniform list of the Ācāryas of the Śrī. Mutt, even in respect of their total number, though far less than that of any other Śaṅ. Mutt — a point for one to ponder over. Even Mr. Krishnan seems to have cited this case not so much to prove the overall spurious character of so many other lists of the Śrī. Ācāryas, as to bring out one more variation therein. And variations there are both major and minor, as pointed out earlier and they certainly need to be explained — at least to be given a thought to.

Location

Allied to the above question is that of the location of the (original) Śrī. mutt, established by Śaṅ. and this is the most pronounced one in the case of the Śrī. mutt. About the location of the Jyotir Mutt and the Govardhana mutt, there is no doubt whatsoever. About the Dwārakā mutt also, there cannot be said to be any genuine dispute, even though the Mūlabagal and Durvāsapur mutts also claim to be the original mutt. In the first place, the very name Dwārakā seems to settle the issue about the original

1. Vide *Śārada and Śaṅ.* at Śrī. by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā. p. 13.

place of the mutt. Secondly, whichever *Śaṅkaravijayas* mention the establishment of the mutts by Śaṅ. locate it at Dwārakā only and not at any of the other two places, which do not figure in Śaṅ.'s itinerary. Thirdly, the names of these two places do not appear anywhere in the *Mathāmnāyas* also, whatever their evidentiary value. Moreover, this mutt is on the west coast whereas neither of the other two mutts belongs to the said place. Both the places are in the Karnāṭaka region and the Mūlabagala Swami came up as the real Ācārya of the Dwārakā Mutt in the middle of the 19th cent. A. D. One of the Ācāryas of the Dwārakā Mutt removes himself to Mūlabagalu in the Kolar Dist. and perhaps starts a mutt and also a Paramparā of Gurus there. Later on, about 1880 A. D., yet another Ācārya of this Mūla. mutt goes to Durvāsapur and starts there a Guruparamparā,¹ but for obvious reasons, neither of these can be said to be the original Dwārakā mutt established by Śaṅ. Whatever the number of claimants, the location of this mutt is beyond dispute.

About the Kāñcī mutt also, there is no dispute about the original mutt established by Śaṅ. At the most, Kumba. Mutt is just an alternative or temporary accommodation for the Kāñcī Mutt and its Ācāryas. There is no dispute about the location in the sense that two rival mutts at two different places claim to be the original one, established by Śaṅ. Nor do they have separate Guru-paramprās. The opponents may deny the establishment of any mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī but no one says that there was or is a dispute between the two mutts, both claiming to be the original one.

In the case of the Śringerī Mutt, there are 6 contenders, viz. अवनि, पुष्पगिरि, विरूपाक्ष, सकेश्वर, Tuṅga Śrī. and Kūḍali, which claim to be the original Śrī. mutt established by Śaṅ. As in the case of the Dwārakā Mutt, however, so also in that of the first four out of the 6, they are not mentioned either in any *Śaṅkaravijaya* or even in the *Mathāmnāyas*, and their origin can be traced to a much later period. The major contender is the Kūḍali mutt in the Shimoga Dt. while the Tuṅga Śrī. Mutt belongs to the Chikka-

1. Vide (i) Kāśī Vyavasthā and Ramāpati Miśra's reply to पण्डितपत्र, dt. 1-4-1935, p. 1, para 1;

(ii) *Śrī Śaṅ. ya and Śaṅ. Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. p. 78; para. 3; p. 79 top and last para. and p. 148.

(iii) *The Traditional Age of Śrī Śaṅ. ya and his Mutts* by Aiyer and Śāstry, p. 173;

Mr. Ramāpati Miśra's letter refers to the Mūlabagala mutt incident only. The other two books refer to both the Mūlabagala mutt and the Dwaraka Mutts.

mangalur Taluka. The arguments advanced in favour of this Kūḍali mutt are as follows :

The first thing that strikes one is the number of Ācāryas of the Kūḍali mutt, which is 65, and this is in line with the number of the Ācāryas of the other three or four mutts, while in the case of the Tuṅga Śrī. mutt, the number of Ācāryas is 35 only. With this number and with 1st cent. B. C. as the date of Śaṅ., initially held by the Śrī. Mutt, the mutt had to grant 800 years to Sureśvara to account for the total period. As pointed out earlier, with their new date 788 A. D. for Śaṅ., it is difficult to account for the period from 788 A. D. upto date with 35 or 36 Ācāryas only while if the date is shifted earlier by about 100 years (i. e. about 683 A. D.), as per R. G. Śarmā and Prof. Umesh and some earlier scholars, it will be still more difficult to do so. In fact, the earlier the date fixed for Śaṅ., the greater will be the difficulty in accounting for the period. This difficulty does not arise in the case of the Kūḍali Mutt, which puts Śaṅ. in the 1st or 2nd B. C.¹ and has more than 60 Ācāryas in their lists.

1. According to Śrī Anantā. Saras., there seems to have been some gap in the Kūḍali Guru-paramparā. The Paramparā says that Śaṅ. placed Pṛthivīdhara in charge of the Kūḍali Mutt and then went to Kāñcī, where he laid down his body. On hearing about Śaṅ.'s passing away, Pṛthvī. placed Viśva. at Kūḍali and himself went to Kāñcī, where he also laid down his body.

Śrī Anantā. Saras. points out that according to PSM, Kaivalyananda of K. Kāma. Pīṭha (55 B. C. to 28 A. D. or 116 B. C. to 33 B. C., as per Śrī T. S. Nārā. Śāstri, Vide his *Age of Śaṅ.* p. 198) asked his disciple Kṛpā. Śaṅ. (28 A. D. to 64 A. D. or 33 B. C. to 8 A. D. as per Śrī T. S. Nārā. Śāstri) to ordain one Viśva. as the Ācārya of the Kūḍali Mutt (which probably had no Ācārya then). This Viśva. was confused with Viśva. Sure., the disciple of Śaṅ., and then सर्वज्ञात्मन् and others were known as his successors in that Mutt. This line continued upto Vidyā. Śaṅ., who is equated with Vidyātīrtha of Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt and who is said to have ruled that i. e. T. Śrī. Mutt from 1229 A. D. to 1333 A. D. According to the Theosophist, Vol. 16, pp. 272-295, however, this Vidyā. Śaṅ. died in 563 A. D. After him, till Bhā. Tīrthā, nothing is known about this Mutt. It was at the time of the Mahomedan invasion under Malik Kufur that Vidyātīrtha, the then head of the K. K. Mutt, sent Vidyāraṇya to Śrī. Vidyāraṇya went to Śrī. with two disciples Candra-Bhā. and Nṛ-Bhā., out of whom he placed the former at (Tuṅgā) Śrī. and the latter at Virāpākṣa, where he found a new mutt. (For all this information, vide Śrī Anantā. Saras.'s *Śrī Saṅ. ya & Saṅ. site Insti.* pp. 95-96.

All this is quite confusing. Both गुरुपरम्परास्तोत्रमाला and जगद्गुरुपरम्पर्यस्तुति pertaining to the Kūḍali Mutt give a continuous line from Ādi Śaṅ. upto their 67th Ācārya, who became the Mutt-head in 1937 A. D. and there is no gap anywhere in the line. Both the lists give 16 heads of the Mutt from Vidyā. Śaṅ. Bhā. to Bhā. Tīrtha and according to the जगद्गुरुपरम्पर्यस्तुति, the regnal period of Vidyā. Śaṅ. Bhā. is 628 A. D. to 656 A. D. There is no second Vidyā.

(Continued on the next page)

Secondly, a tradition is current that Maṇḍana's wife Bhārati walked behind Śaṇ. on the condition that he would not look back. As she was walking behind him, the sound of her anklets assured Śaṇ. that she was following him. When, however, they came to Kūḍali, her feet got stuck up in the sand there and her anklets stopped making any sound. Becoming suspicious, Śaṇ. looked back and Bhārati disappeared immediately. Then, Śaṇ. is said to have established a Mutt there only and also installed an image there but in a standing posture, which is in keeping with the tradition. At (Tuṅga) Śringeri and other places, we have Śārādā in a sitting posture. This story has been given in *Kuṣmāṇḍa Ś. V.*¹ and also by Mr. Surya Rao (Row) in his two books *A Short History of Vijayanagara Empire* and *A History of Śivagaṅgā Mutt*² more elaborately in the former. That Śaṇ. consecrated Vāṇi (i. e. Bhārati) on the bank of the Tuṅgabhadra river is borne out by *Guruvaiṣṇakāvya* (III. 31) and the commentary thereon. It is also so given by Sri Brahmavidyānanda Bhārati of the Avani Mutt (Ācārya No. 51) in his *Ś. V. Diṇḍima*.³

Similarly, there is also a local tradition that Śārādā visits (Tuṅgā) Śringeri from Kūḍali only during the Navarātri festival every year.⁴

The Śringeri Mutt is said by all — including Sadā. Cid. etc. — to have been established by Śaṇ. on the bank of the river Tuṅgabhadra, where the sage Rṣyaṅga performed penance. Regarding the location of this mutt, however, there is difference of opinion. In this connection, Inscription No. 77 of Chikkamangalur, Kaṇṇi Dt., tells us (in st. 1) that at the confluence of the Tuṅgā and Bhadrā rivers, sages like Mārkaṇḍeya, Agastya and Rṣyaṅga, the son of Vibhāṇḍaka Muni, performed penance and that a mountain sprang up at the place.⁵ The mountain must have

(Continued from the last page)

Śaṇ. Bhā., who could have passed away in 568 A.D. as per the Theosophist. How the Theosophist says so and how Śrī Anantā. Saras. accepted it, is not clear. Even Sri Aiyer and Sri Sastry have done so. (Vide : *The Traditional Age of Śrī Śaṇ. & his Mutts*, p. 86)

The question of a tangle pertaining to three Ācāryas - Vidyātīrtha, Bhā. Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and Vidyāraṇya - is discussed a little later.

1. Vide *Kuṣmāṇḍa Ś. V.* Ch. V : 8 to 12.
2. Vide (i) *A Short History of Vijayanagara Empire* by B. Surya Row;
(ii) *A History of Śivagaṅgā Mutt* by B. Surya Row, p. 56, (1914 A.D.).
3. Vide *Śrī Śaṇ. and Śaṇ.ite Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. p. 94.
4. Vide *The Traditional Age of Śaṇ. and his Mutts* by Aiyer and Sastry, p. 89.
5. Vide *Epigraphica Karanatika* (Vol. VI.), p. 186, quoted in Śrī Anantā. Saras., p. 87.

become known as Śṛṅgagiri as a result of the same. Swāmis or Ācāryas at Tuṅgā-Śṛṅgerī also assumed the titles ऋष्यशृङ्गपुरवराधीश and तुङ्गभद्रा-सीरवासी. Even the शृङ्गेरीमठान्नायस्तोत्र refers to the तुङ्गभद्रास्थतीर्थ, शारदाशक्ति and the hermitage of ऋष्यशृङ्ग.¹

Geographically, however, Tuṅgā Śṛṅgerī is on the left bank of the river Tuṅgā (and not Tuṅgā-bhadra) while it is Kūḍali which is actually at the confluence of the two rivers Tuṅgā and Bhadrā. And the same titles affirm an unbroken line of Ācāryas from Ādi. Śaṅ., Ācāryas who stayed at विद्यानगरमहाराजधानी.

Regarding विद्यानगर महा०, Inscription No. 77 of Śimogā Tq., purporting to convey some gifts to the then Śṛṅ. Swāmi Vijaya-Śaṅkara Bhārati (1074 A. D. to 1070 A. D.), attaches to the Swāmi, attributes like भूमण्डला-चार्य, ऋष्याश्रम, नरसिंहक्षेत्र (विजयनगरस्थ - lines 74 and 75).²

Similarly, in Inscription No. 78 of the same Śimoga Tq., referring to certain gifts to the स्वयंभुव नरसिंहदेवरु at Kūḍali for the maintenance of चन्दादीप, we find attached to the Ācārya (Swāmi) words like नरसिंहक्षेत्रद, तुङ्गभद्रासङ्गमद, दक्षिणवाराणसीय कूडलिय.³

Now, Ācārya Vijaya Śaṅkara Bhārati (1074 A. D. to 1170 A. D.) belongs to Kūḍali Mutt only as Tuṅgā Śṛṅ. Mutt has no Vijaya Śaṅ. at all in its list and the time of the Inscription, viz. 1153 A. D. given for him is also not contradicted.

Secondly, we find that the three inscriptions, one pertaining to Chikka-maṅgalur and two to Śimoga, are consecutive (77, 78, 79) and hence, they must naturally pertain to one and the same mutt. It is noteworthy that Ins. No. 79 of these three specifically mentions Kūḍali and hence it is proper that all the three inscriptions should be taken to refer to the Kūḍali Śṛṅ. Mutt. Vijaya Śaṅ., who is referred to as Śṛṅ. Swāmi then becomes the head of the Kūḍali Śṛṅ. Mutt and not of the Tuṅgā-Śṛṅ. Mutt. The three inscriptions together show that the Kūḍali Śṛṅ. (Mutt) has been known by various names such as नरसिंहक्षेत्र, दक्षिणवाराणसी, तुङ्गभद्रासङ्गम, कूडलि, विद्या-नगर, ऋष्याश्रम, or ऋष्यशृङ्गाश्रम or शृङ्गेरी and they also show that inscriptional evidence bears out that the Kūḍali Mutt existed and received grants from

1. Vide *Śṛī Śaṅ. ya and Śaṅ. ite Insti.* by Śṛī Anantā. Saras., pp. 87 (end) and p. 88 (top).

2. Vide *Epigra. Karna.* Vol. VI, p. 80, Shimoga Taluka.

3. Ibid. p. 79, Shimoga Taluka.

Both these references, 2 and 3, have been taken from *Śṛī Śaṅ. ya and Śaṅ. ite Insti.* by Śṛī Anantā. Saras., p. 88.

1155 A. D. while the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt did so after 1345 or 1350 A. D. only. All this leads to the inference that the Śringerī of Śaṅ. 's times and his immediate successors was Kūḍali Śringerī and not the Tuṅgā Śringerī.

Mr. S. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa argues that relying on the words 'Mutt on the banks of the Tuṅga-bhadrā' found in *G. V. K.* at III : 31, Śaṅ. is credited with founding a mutt at Kūḍali.¹ His argument is that the same work refers to Vibhāṇḍaka's hermitage (III : 20-22) and the hermitage of Rṣyaśṛṅga on the bank of the Tuṅga-bhadrā (III : 30) and these references clinch the issue in favour of Tuṅga Śrī. only.² This, however, is not the whole truth. The reference to Śaṅ. 's establishing a Mutt on the bank of the Tuṅga-bhadrā is found in other works also like *Madhaviya*, *Cid-ya* etc. and as pointed out already, it is also available in Inscription No. 77 of *Epigraphica Karnatica*. It is worth noting that there is no reference anywhere, direct or indirect, to a Mutt by Śaṅ. on the bank of river Tuṅgā. The reference is to Tuṅgabhadrā only³ and this must count for something, however much one may say that undue stress has been put on the word Tuṅgabhadrā. Moreover, it has also been shown that the name Kūḍali, which is properly on the bank of the river Tuṅga-bhadrā — nay, right at the confluence, is known by various names such as नरसिंहक्षेत्र, कूडलि, विद्यानगर and कृष्णशृङ्गाश्रम, where sages like Mārkaṇḍeya, Agastya and Rṣyaśṛṅga performed penance. The serpent-frog incident cannot disprove so many pieces of evidence. Moreover, this incident is found mentioned in *Guruvāṁśakāvya* only, of the 18th cent. A. D. and an openly pro Śringerī Mutt work, out of the 16 or 17

1. Vide *Sāraṇ and Śaṅ. at Śrī*, by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā. p.17, para 1.

2. Ibid. pp. 20 and 18 and Indian Express, 16.3.91.

3. According to Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā., there is, according to तुङ्गभद्रामहात्म्य (Greatness of Tuṅgabhadrā), a small poem, no difference between Tuṅgā and Tuṅgabhadrā. Tuṅgā and Bhadrā have been given as the two branches of a common river that emanates from a single source and ... they come together at Kūḍali and hence are considered as a single river Tuṅgabhadrā.

The name of the original river has not been given either by Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā. or by Mr. K. R. Veṅkaṭaraman and obviously it is not Tuṅgabhadrā but something else. The two branch rivers are known by their separate names only till they join at Kūḍali, where only they acquire the name Tuṅgabhadrā and not till then. That they should not be referred to as being separate is only a religious idea and not a geographical fact. Thirdly, the present Śrī. has been said by all to be situated on the bank of the river Tuṅgā only, one of the two branches. If it is situated in the doab of the two rivers, as said by Mr. K. R. Veṅkaṭaraman (*Throne*), Kūḍali is situated right at the confluence, where it actually becomes Tuṅgabhadrā-river for all practical purposes. Kūḍali is, therefore, primarily and directly तुङ्गभद्रातीरवासी while the present Śrī. can be so only secondarily and indirectly. (Regarding the geographical situation of present Śrī., vide the book of Śrī Anantā. Saras., p.88).

Śaṅkaravijayas. At the most, it may serve to show that the author of the *Guruvamsakāvya* meant the particular Mutt on the bank of the river Tuṅgā only and not the one at Kūḍali.

Mr. Krishnan has tried to show that the famous hermitage of Vibhāṇḍaka and Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, the two well-known epic sages, must have "existed in north-eastern India, somewhere on the border of Āṅgadeśa (modern Assam) and not in the north-western part of South India." He has cited the support of the two epics for his view, the *Rāmāyaṇa* (of Vālmiki) and the *MBh.* and has finally expressed surprise as to when and how Ṛṣyaśṛṅga's hermitage got transplanted at Śṛṅgerī.¹

Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan has tried to controvert this finding and has affirmed that the said hermitage existed in the region of Śṛṅgerī and the Tuṅgabhadrā river only. He has also cited the support of the same epics - particularly the *MBh.* and an article in *I. A.* and naturally maintained that the mutt established by Śaṅ. was at modern Śṛṅ. (i. e. Tuṅga Śṛṅ.) only.²

Without going into this controversy, we may say that whichever may be technically correct i. e. in keeping with the epics, we have to see as to what the *Śaṅkaravijayas* say about the 4th mutt established by Śaṅ. in the South. And then we find that they (i. e. *Ś. V.s*) say almost uniformly that Śaṅ. established the 4th mutt in the South at Śṛṅgerī on the bank of Tuṅga-bhadrā, near or in the vicinity of the Ṛṣya hermitage. (It may be noted that there is no direct reference to such a mutt in the *Mādhaviya*.) Whatever the other particulars about the location of the Mutt, the reference to the Tuṅgabhadrā river in the *Ś. V.s* cannot be connected in any manner with the hermitage in north-eastern India. In the light of this and also in the light of the uniform tradition that Śaṅ. established his 4th mutt in South India only, we have to see where this mutt is likely to have been established. Then, there are only two alternatives before us, viz. Tuṅga Śṛṅ. and Kūḍali Śṛṅ. and it has been shown already that the greater probability is in favour of Kūḍali Śṛṅgerī, as the place of the 4th mutt in the South. What the object of Mr. Krishnan was in dislocating this Ṛṣya-hermitage is not at all clear, unless it was merely to show that Śaṅ. could not have established a Mutt at Śṛṅgerī, on the bank of the Tuṅgā river. He, however, specifically mentions none.

Mr. K. R. Venkataramana, a staunch supporter of the Tuṅgā-Śṛṅ. mutt, says clearly that "for about 5 centuries till the first half of the 14th

1. Vide *The Śṛṅ. Mātṛa* by Sri B. Krishnan Ch. V, pp. 29-31.

2. Vide his *Śārada and Śaṅ. at Śṛṅ.* Ch. V, pp. 42-46.

cent. A. D., the Ācāryas and their monastic disciples lived in hermitages spread round modern Śringerī.¹ This means, in other words, that there was no Mutt proper at Modern Śringerī till 1346 A. D., when it was founded by Vidyāranya Muni, with the royal patronage of Vijayanagar kings Hakka and Bukka. The first epigraphical evidence is, as said already, dated 1346 A. D. only. This squares more properly with the statement of *Mādhaviya* (i. e. *San̥kṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya*) that Śaṅ. established an *āśrama* only at Śringerī, which for him was the same as modern Tuṅgā Śringerī. As pointed out earlier, even Mr. R. G. Śarmā, a severe critic of the K. K. Mutt and a staunch supporter of the Śrī. (i. e. Tuṅgā) mutt, has remarked at two places that there is no clear reference to such a mutt in the work of Mādhava; it has to be understood sheerly by inference.²

If Kūḍali Śrī. is the original Mutt established by Śaṅ., then it will have to be explained as to how and when the Tuṅgā-Śrī. Mutt came into existence. And we find that different accounts have been given by different persons but in two ways.

(1) Sri Anantānendra Sarasvatī explains as follows :

The modern i. e. Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt came into being somewhere in 1346 A. D. Ācārya Bhārati Tīrtha of Kūḍali Śrī. Mutt, the 30th in succession from the original founder, after installing Mādhava, the celebrated Vidyāranya at the mutt, chose to retire for penance on the bank of the Tuṅgā river in 1350 A. D. This place, where the real i. e. Kūḍali Śrī. Swāmi resided, naturally came to be known as Śringerī. Vidyāranya then earned a grant of this village Śringerī along with some other surrounding villages from king Harihara for the benefit of the Mutt where the retired Ācārya stayed.

For about 200 years, the affairs of the new Śrī. Mutt went on smoothly. About 1580 A. D. Nṛsimha Bhārati, the then Kūḍali Śrī. Swāmi, went on tour to North India and remained away from the Mutt for a long time. In his absence, some people at the mutt appropriated its property, and declaring the Swāmi defunct, put up on the *gāḍī* another person, also named Nṛ. Bhā. by the method of पुस्तकसंन्यास. When the original Swāmi actually returned, he witnessed the new situation and then the matter was referred to the then ruling Keladi prince Venkaṭappā Nāyak (1552 to 1629 A. D.), who gave the ruling that the original Swāmiji should stay at Kūḍali, free to travel about with all the powers of the Jagad-guru while the new Swāmiji should reside at Tuṅgā Śringerī, doing only worship of the deity there and manag

1. Vide Śaṅ. and his Śārada. Pīṭha at Śrī. p. 31 (beginning).

2. Vide JSMV pp. 179 and 475.

ing the affairs of the same mutt. This is said to be borne out by the writings of Nṛ. Bhā. of Tuṅgā Śrī., who, according to inscriptions No. 2 and No. 12 of Śrī. Jāgir pp. 348, 374, admits that he is the disciple at the lotuslike feet (चरणारविन्दशिष्य) of Nṛ. Bhā. of Kūḍali (Swāmi) as opposed to the order of Jagad-gurus (proper — करकमलसञ्जात).¹

After remarking that 4 lists of Kūḍali Ācāryas agree in the main, Śrī Anantā. Sarasvatī notes a variation of the story given above as follows :

About 1570 A. D., an Ācārya of (Tuṅgā) Śrīgerī Mutt went on a tour to the north, leaving instructions to his disciples that if he did not return by a certain time, they might choose another Ācārya as the head of the Mutt. When he did not return by that time, one Rāmacandra Bhāratī was ordained by पुस्तकसंन्यास as the head of the mutt. After some time, however, the original Ācārya returned but the local Śrī. authorities did not allow him to go to (Tuṅgā) Śrī. and hence he stopped at Kūḍali only. This matter was then taken to the Kelaḍi chief, who ruled that Rāmacandra Bhāratī should remain at Tuṅgā Śrī., looking after the worship of Śāradā and the affairs of the Mutt and should not go out for *deśa-saṁcāra* while the Ācārya at Kūḍali alone should go on tour. This is said to be corroborated by Avani and Saṅkeśvara Mutts and by Śrī. Brahmānanda Nātha Bhāratī of Avani Mutt and Rāma. Bhā. is said to have undertaken to send accounts and amounts also as per the same to the Kūḍali Mutt. Not only he did accordingly, but even the Avani and Śivagaṅgā mutts, regarded as the branches of Tuṅgā-Śrī. Mutt, were said to be sending annual contributions to the Kūḍali Mutt.²

Śāstri and Iyer refer to one such incident only. According to them, about 1570 A. D., Nṛ. Bhā. of Kūḍali Śrī. Mutt went to Kedāra on a tour and did not return for many years. The local authorities, therefore, appointed another Nṛ. Bhāratī by the method of पुस्तकसंन्यास. When, however, the original Nṛ. Bhāratī returned, the new Nṛ. Bhā. was sent to Tuṅgā. Śrī. and was asked not to go out for Digvijaya. This was notified by the then Kelaḍi Chief, Kriṣṇappā Nāyak who ruled that the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Ācārya should not go out for Digvijaya.³

All these three versions are quite similar though not identical. They are mutually corroborative in spite of certain variations.

1. For this account, vide *Śrī Saṅ. and Saṅ. Ins.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras., pp. 89-90.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
3. Vide *The Traditional Age of Śrī Saṅkara and His Mutts* by Aiyer and Śāstry, pp. 89-90.

Thus, Nṛ. Bhā. in the first version of Śrī Anantā. Saras. is replaced by Rāma. Bhā. in his second version while in the same (second) version, Śāstrī and Iyer give Nṛ. Bhā. only as the person sent to Tuṅgā Śrī. with instructions to limit his activities to the worship of the deity there and the management of Mutt-affairs. The time factor also agrees better with Nṛ. Bhā. than with Rāma. Bhā. It is, however, not possible to check up whether the Keladi Chief Venkaṭappā Nāyaka (Anantā. Saras.) and Kriṣṇappā Nāyaka (Śāstrī and Iyer) are one and the same person, as both of them have been referred to almost the same period i. e. about 1550 A. D. to 1630 A. D.

These versions, containing as they do just one story only, along with the inscriptional evidence adduced already, seem to show that Kūḍali Śrī. Mutt was quite an old one, having a line of Ācāryas long before 1570 A. D. More than this, it was independent of the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt and not at all its branch, "which came into existence some centuries later, under the guidance and encouragement of the Śringerī gurus and the emperors."¹ Who were the gurus and the emperors who did this "centuries later" than Vidyāranya i. e. 14th cent. A. D? As said earlier, the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt proper came into existence at the time of Vidyāranya only, with the help of the Vijayanagara kings and even Dr. A. K. Śāstrī has said that the Kaḍilas also of Śrī. Mutt trace its history only from the 14th to the 19th cent. A. D.² while "the earliest stone inscription from the point of view of the study of the Śrī. Maṭha is dated Śaka 1276 = 1346 A. D."³ That the Kūḍali Mutt is absolutely independent of the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt and that Kūḍali Swami cannot be said to be the most conspicuous of the one time agents appointed by the Tuṅgā Śrī. Swami, who have pretended to be equal to its Swami,⁴ is sufficiently strongly borne out by the following pieces of evidence.⁵

(1) About 1723 A. D., during the reign of the 52nd Ācārya of Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt, the heads of the Kūḍali, Tuṅgā. Śrī. and Saṅkeśvara mutts met at Satara to discuss as to who of the three (heads) was to be accorded Agrapūjā, and it was decided that the head of the Kūḍ. Śrī. mutt only was entitled to that honour.

1. Vide *Throne of Transcendental Wisdom* by Sri K. R. Venkaṭarāman, 1990 Edn., p. 53.
2. Vide *A History of Śrī.* by Dr. A. K. Śāstrī, p. 9.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
4. Vide *Śārada and Saṅ. at Śrī.* by Śrī Saṅkara Nārāyaṇa, pp. 61-62.
5. For these pieces of evidence, vide *The Traditional Age of Saṅ. and His Mutts* by Sri Aiyer and Śrī Śāstrī, pp. 90-91.

(2) During the reign of Nṛ. Bhā., the 53rd Ācārya of the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt (1727-1751 A. D.), the Ācārya of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt was restrained by the Keladi Chief, Basavappā Nāyak II from going out for Digvijaya.

(3) In 1806 A. D., during the reign of Śaṅ. Bhā. Swāmi, the 56th Ācārya of the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt, the Ācārya of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt was once again restrained by Pūrṇayyā, the famous minister of Hyder Ali and Tippu Sultan from going out for Digvijaya.

(4) In 1811 A. D., Kṛṣṇa-rājendra III of Mysore allowed Nṛ. Bhā., the 57th head of the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt (1807-1820 A. D.) to go out for Digvijaya, having recognised his titles to his being the Jagad-guru.

(5) In 1820 A. D., during the reign of Śaṅ. Bhā., the 57th Ācārya of Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt (1820-1856 A. D.), the head of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt was again restrained from going out of Śrī. while in 1851 A. D., the same Kūḍ. Śrī. Ācārya was accorded royal honours when he visited Mysore.

(6) Lastly, in 1836 A. D., during the reign of the same Śaṅ. Bhā. Swāmi as in no. 5 above, a suit was filed in the Mysore Court by the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt for an injunction restraining the Kūḍ. Śrī. Ācārya from going on tour in Addāpallaki and accepting other honours as the Kūḍ. Mutt was only a Tuṇḍu Mutt i. e. a branch of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt, which alone was entitled to do so. This suit was decided in favour of the T. Śrī. Mutt in the lower court but in the appeal against the same in the Huzur Saddar Adālat of Mysore (Appeal No. 22 of 1847 of the Court), it was held that the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt was not a branch of the T. Śrī. Mutt and that the Kūḍ. Śrī. Ācārya was entitled to go on tour with Addāpallaki and full honours due to his independent status. The appeal judgment was confirmed by Sir Mark Cubbon, Commissioner (Regent) of Mysore in a special appeal before him by the T. Śrī. Mutt.

(II) The other way of explaining the origin of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt is as follows :

According to Śāstri and Iyer, Śaṅ. appointed Pṛthvidhara at Kūḍali as its first Ācārya and then himself went to Kāñci, where he laid down his body. On hearing this, Pṛthvidhara hastened to Kāñci and he also laid down his body there. Probably, he left behind him his successors at Kūḍali and from 477 B. C. (Śaṅ.'s Niryaṇa) to 28 B. C., there were perhaps about a dozen Ācāryas as per Hultzsch's ms. But then there was no successor thereafter. Perhaps, the then Ācārya of Kūḍali Śrī. mutt went to Kēḍāra on tour and did not return and hence, the seat there was vacant. It was then

that Kaivalyānanda, the then reigning Ācārya of the Kāñcī Kāma. Mutt instructed Kṛpā. Śaṅ. (who was to succeed him) to send someone to Kūḍalī, and accordingly, Kṛpā. Śaṅ. sent one Subhāṭa Viśvarūpa to Kūḍalī. When, however, the original Ācārya of the Mutt returned, this Viśvarūpa was given a new mutt at Tuṅgā Śrī. and was appointed there. This was in 28 B. C. This Viśvarūpa was equated with Sureśvara, and his successor with Sarvajñātman. It was thus that the history of the Tuṅgā mutt was traced to the 1st cent. B. C. Then, Śaṅ. also was placed in the period 44 B. C. to 12 B. C., so that Viśva.—Sure. could come immediately after Śaṅ. Thereafter, we have Ācāryas upto Vidyā. Śaṅ. Tīrtha, who is assigned to the period 1229-1333 A. D., so that Bhārati-Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha could be his immediate successor. However, according to the *Theosophist*, this Vidyā-Śaṅ. Tīrtha died in 569 A. D. at Nirmal in Bombay. This means that the Tuṅgā Śrī. seat of Śaṅ. was vacant from 569 A. D. to 1333 A. D. *Suśamā* also says that after 11 Ācāryas after (Ādi) Śaṅ., there was no head at Tuṅgā Śrī. for 800 years (from 569-1333 A. D.). Kāñcī itself was passing through difficult times and hence could not fill up the gap again.

According to Śāstri and Aiyer, the names of the Ācāryas at Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt from Prthvīdhara to Subhāṭa Viśvarūpa, i. e. 477 B. C. to 28 B. C. are permanently lost to us. Lastly this mutt tried to account for the gap by granting 800 years to Sureśvara and bringing him to 772 A. D.¹

Vidyā-Tīrtha or Vidyā. Śaṅ. was the Ācārya of the Kāñcī-Kāma. Mutt in the 14th cent. A. D. (1297-1385 A. D.). Under his instructions, Bhārati Tīrtha and Vidyāranya, particularly the latter, tried their best to restore the old order at Tuṅgā. Śrī. and to found 8 other Mutts.²

Perhaps, the two writers argue, there was a gap in the line of Ācāryas of Kūḍalī. Śrī. Mutt. also, about 1320 A. D. The 28th Ācārya of that Mutt (Bhārati Śaṅ. 1153 to ?) died about 1320 A. D. and as he had not nominated any successor, there was a gap in the line. Then, Vidyā-Tīrtha of Kāma Pīṭha and his disciples Bhārati-Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and Vidyāranya came to Kārṇāṭaka. Vidyātīrtha had his headquarters at Kūḍalī, where perhaps the seat of the Ācārya was vacant. Then, in 1333 A. D., Vidyāranya, at the instance of Vidyātīrtha, revived the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt by placing Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha there as Ācārya and then founded the Virūpākṣa mutt of which he himself became the first head.

From about 1320 A. D., both Vidyātīrtha and Vidyāranya jointly managed the affairs of the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt till 1350 A. D., after which

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 76-80.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

time, one Nṛ. Bhā. was appointed as Ācārya there and thus the succession at that mutt was restored. Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha's inclusion in the Kūḍali line must be considered to be a mistake as he could not have been the head of the Kūḍ. Śrī. and Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutts simultaneously. Similarly, Vidyāranya also could not have been an Ācārya of Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt after Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha as he was the head of the Virūpākṣa Mutt. As such, T. Śrī. mutt is not correct in including him in the list of its Ācāryas. Vidyātīrtha or Vidyā-Śaṅ., having died already in 569 A. D. only, there was no Ācārya of that name in the list of that Mutt's Ācāryas from 1228 A. D. to 1333 A. D.¹

Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī seems to agree with the theory of the gap between 569 A. D. and 1333 A. D., though he does not refer to the gap between Pṛthvīdhara and Viśvarūpa, the names of the intervening Ācāryas being lost for ever. He says clearly that Pṛthvīdhara appointed Viśvarūpa at Kūḍali before going to Kāñci and this is in keeping with the Hultzsch Ms. However, he then refers to the probable absence of an Ācārya at Kūḍali 'then' and this gap is said to have been filled by Viśvarūpa, appointed there by Kṛpā-Śaṅ. at the instance of his Guru Swami Kaivalyānanda, both Ācāryas of the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt. This Viśvarūpa is then said to have been (wrongly) identified with Sureśvara, the direct disciple of Śaṅkara and then Sureśvara's successor Nityabodha with Sarvajñātman. These two, viz. Viśva. = Sure. and Nitya. = Sarva. and others were shown as his successors at this mutt. This line seems to have continued upto Vidyā. Śaṅ., who was equated by the Tuṅgā Śrī. mutt with Vidyātīrtha, who was then said to have occupied that Mutt from 1229 A. D. to 1333 A. D. According to the *Theosophist*, however, this Vidyā. Śaṅ. died in 569 A. D. and then upto Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha, nothing is known about this (Tuṅgā. Śrī.) Mutt.

At the time of this Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha there was much political turmoil and trouble on account of Malik Kafur's invasions and at that time, Vidyātīrtha of K. Kāma Pīṭha sent Vidyāranya to (Tuṅgā) Śringerī. Accordingly, Vidyāranya went there (either from Kāñci or Kumbha.) along with his two disciples Candrasekhara Bhārati and Nṛsiṃha Bhārati. He appointed the former at (Tuṅgā) Śringerī and the latter at Virūpākṣa Mutt, which he founded newly. Though there is a tradition believing that Vidyāranya stayed at Virūpākṣa Mutt and never came back to the Śrī. Mutt, it is clear from the Kūḍali list of Ācāryas that his disciple Candrasekhara Bhārati was installed by him at Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt.²

1. For this statement of the two writers, *ibid.* pp. 161-163.

2. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras., pp. 94-95.

This installation of Ācāryas at the Śrī. Mutt and other Mutts is corroborated by other sources also as follows.

(1) According to पुष्प० मठा० in Pantalu's *Śāṅkara Maṭha Tattva Prakāśārtha Saṅgraha*, Vidyāranya went to Śringerī from Kāñci at the instance of Vidyātīrtha in the year Śaka 1178 = 1256 A. D. and according to *Guru-paramparācarita* also, he went to Śrī. but from Kumba. According to Puṣpa-Maṭhā., he went back to Kāñci. where he passed away at the कैलासनाथस्वामी temple.

(2) Sri G. V. Guṇḍappā also says in his books on Vidyāranya that he obtained orders from Vidyātīrtha at Kāñci.

(3) Śrī. V. V. S. Avadhāni, in his *History of Vidyāranya* in Telugu, says that according to one book he received from Tarkarāma-Śāstri of Bellary, Vidyāranya was born to Tamil parents in Kāñci.¹

(4) An article in *Viśva-Karṇāṭaka* (dt. 8-11-53) says that Vidyāranya was sent to Kāñci for study under Vidyātīrtha, the then head of the Kāñci Mutt.²

As far as I am aware, all these statements emanate from sources other than the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt authorities or its supporters. On the contrary, Mr. Pantalu was a staunch adherent of the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt. And these statements tell us that Vidyātīrtha was the head of the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt, that Vidyāranya belonged to Kāñci side and that Vidyātīrtha directed Vidyāranya to go to (Tuṅgā) Śringerī to restore the old order there, which was out of gear. Thereby, they seem to agree with and bear out generally the statement of *Suśamā* that under the instructions from Vidyātīrtha, Vidyāranya founded eight mutts in the Karṇāṭaka region and one for himself.³

There is some difficulty about the pontificate of these three persons, namely, Vidyātīrtha, Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and Vidyāranya, all of whom have been claimed both by Kūḍ. Śrī. and Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutts as their own (consecutive) Ācāryas quite surprisingly during the same period, viz. 1228 A. D. to 1386 A. D. Obviously, none of them could have been the Ācārya of both

1. Read : सौम्यान्दे चैत्रमासे तु उत्तरायणे रवौ । शुक्लपक्षे चतुर्दश्यां कपेटे सोमवासरे ॥
शिवकाञ्च्यां शम्भुनामा द्विजवधकुले विभुः । आविरासीन्महादेवः कैलासादागतो मुनिः ॥
नाम्ना माधव इत्येवं प्रथितः शङ्करः कलौ ।

Quoted in *Śrī Saṅ. and Saṅ. Ineti*, by Śrī Anantā. Saras., p. 97.

2. Śrī Anantā. Saras., *op. cit.* p. 97.

3. Read : श्रूयते चायमेव श्रीशङ्करानन्देन्द्रमुनिना दत्तविचारण्यनामा सहैवाऽऽभिः सङ्गचारिभिः
सच्चिदानन्दादिभिः अचीकृष्य अष्टौ मठान्. आत्मनश्चैकं अधितुङ्गमद्रं अनुविरूपाक्षेश्वरं अतिवैलम्बद-
म्भादिमतप्रचाररोषिण इति । *Suśamā* on *GRM.*, St. 76.

the Mutts simultaneously. Śāstri and Aiyer have described this phenomenon as the Vidyāranya triangle¹ and their opinion in the matter has already been stated elsewhere.

Śrī Anantā. Saras. also seems to hold that Vidyātīrtha belonged to the K. K. Mutt, and he has provided at least *prima facie* evidence in support of his view. According to him, Vidyāranya also does not seem to belong to either of the two Mutts. He appointed Candra Bhāratī. at the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt as the first Ācārya after Vidyā. Śaṅ. who passed away in 569 A. D., so that according to him also, there was a gap in the line of Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt. Ācāryas from 569 A. D. to 1333 A. D., though it is difficult to see how in that case, Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha could be said to belong to that Mutt. Śāstri and Aiyer, however, acknowledge Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha as one of its Ācāryas.

The treatment of this subject by Śāstri and Aiyer is more speculative than positive while that of Śrī Anantā. Saras. is more positive than otherwise. Yet, both of them seem to be agreed on holding that Śaṅ. must have established his mutt at Kūṇ. Śrī. while Tuṅgā Mutt is of a much later date. Both again seem to hold that Vidyātīrtha was an Ācārya of the K. K. Mutt and neither he nor Vidyāranya was ever an Ācārya of the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt though both were responsible for its revival in the 14th cent. A. D. after a long lapse of about 800 years. Similarly, both seem to place Śaṅ. in the 6th-5th cent. B. C. and calculate all timings in terms of the same, though with some points of difference. Nothing appears to be definite or conclusive, but the shifting of dates of Śaṅ. by the Tuṅgā-Śrī. Mutt has made matters more uncertain and indecisive. There seems to be no doubt that there was definitely some gap in their list of succession of Ācāryas but the definite ends and the duration of the same cannot be ascertained today in the absence of some better source to guide us.

Then, again, neither Bhāratī Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha nor Vidyāranya makes any reference in his own works to any Mutt at (Tuṅgā) Śringerī or to his having been its head at any time. Moreover, which are the works of other writers and/or scholars, which contain references to this mutt, not to mention the other three mutts, which have still been accepted as having been established by Śaṅ. ? Critics who raise such questions in the case of the K. K. Mutt or its Ācāryas, should have furnished evidence to this effect but they have not done so.

1. Vide Aiyer and Śāstry, *op. cit.*, Appendix C, *The Vidyāranya Tangle*, pp. 159-163.

The same reasoning applies to questions as to when and where the different Ācāryas of the different mutts were initiated or passed away or where their Adhiṣṭhānas are to be found. All such questions are as much unanswerable in the case of most of the mutts accepted as having been established by Śaṅkara and not in that of K. K. Mutt alone. In fact, the real difference between the lists of the K. K. Mutt and those of the other mutts is that the former lent itself to scrutiny, which has been actually carried out by the critics to the detriment or inconvenience of the K. K. Mutt while the lists of the other mutts have not been so scrutinised because they did not appear to be capable of or needing such a scrutiny and hence have gone unchallenged. If only the K. K. Mutt had furnished a list of some ordinary persons as Ācāryas, whose accounts could not be checked or scrutinised, their list at least (if not the other points) would have remained unchallenged.

As said earlier, epigraphically, the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutt received its first grant from the Vijayanagar kings in 1346 A. D. and then another in 1356 A. D., in the form of lands to Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha for the performance of penance and so on, and it was after the victories of Harihara and Bukka over their enemies that the Tuṅgā. Śrī. Ācāryas came to be addressed as कर्णाटकसिंहासनस्थापनाचार्य.

Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan tries to point out that the inscription of 1346 A. D. refers to a Dharma-Saṁsthāna established by Śaṅkara, and the statement thereafter about the establishment of a Mutt can mean only the large grants, endowments, developments to Maṭha-buildings and Agra-hāra with houses.¹ This implies that both the Maṭha and the Agra-hāra existed already.

If, however, the establishment of a Mutt is presumed to mean development etc. of the Mutt only that was there already, it will also have to be presumed that Agra-hāra also, which has been said to be referred to in the same inscription, was there in existence already. The expression 'established a Maṭha and an Agra-hāra', however, seems to be clear beyond doubt and cannot, by any rules of language, be twisted to mean anything except that a Mutt and an Agra-hāra were established for the first time only. Moreover, none of the Ś. V.s nor any other written evidence refers to any Mutt established by Śaṅkara as a Dharma-piṭha. The Śrī. Mutt was just like any other Mutt established by Śaṅkara and if the Śrī. Mutt were a

1. Vide *Śrīraṭṭa and Śaṅ. at Śrī. by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā.*, p. 52.

Dharma-piṭha, others Mutts also were equally entitled to be so called. Dr. A. K. Śāstry, who says clearly that the inscription of 1346 A. D. contains the first epigraphical reference to a Mutt at Śrī., also says equally clearly that "it was during the pontificate of Vidyāranya that Śrī., besides being a Maṭha, became a Saṁsthāna (Dharma Saṁsthāna) due to acquisition of lands."¹ Mr. Venkataraman's statement that till the time of Vidyāranya i. e. 14th cent. A. D., the Ācāryas lived in hermitage only round about Śrī. has been cited already. Mr. Venkataraman once again says clearly that the pontificate Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and Śrī Vidyāranya witnessed the conversion of Śringerī, hitherto a cluster of hermitages, into an *imperium et impera*.² Both Dr. Śāstry and Mr. Venkataraman are staunch supporters of the (Tuṅgā) Śrī. Mutt and yet neither of them tries to interpret them in the way done by Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan.

Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan's statement about *Mādhaviya*³ declaring unequivocally that Śaṅ. founded the Śrī. Mutt has already been shown to be not true and that this has been admitted by Mr. R. G. Śarmā not once but twice, has also been pointed out earlier more than once.

Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan's argument that a spiritual seat is never founded by a king⁴ can be accepted as true but a Mutt can be said to have been established by a king in the sense that he helped someone like Vidyāranya to found it and then helped its development by grant of land, endowments and so on for the same. Moreover, if Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan's argument is accepted *in toto*, how to explain the statement of the critics of the K. K. Mutt that the Kumba Mutt (to the critics, the Kāñcī Mutt is nothing more or less than the Kumba Mutt), was started by the Tanjore king? Obviously, it may have been established and then flourished with his help.

Now, if we look into the epigraphs proper, we find that there is no reference to any Mutt or even to any Agrahāra at Śrī. as has been said by different writers, though Mr. Venkaṭa very cleverly refers to the inscription of 1346 A. D. as "the first land grant to the Śrī. Mutt by Hari I,"⁵ thereby taking for granted the existence of the Mutt there prior to 1346 A. D. In a slightly different language, Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan implies the same thing when he says that "the name Śrī. always reminded one of Śaṅ.'s Mutt" and that "in those days, when only four Maṭhas founded by Śaṅ. were operating,

1. Vide *A History of Śringerī* by Dr. A. K. Śāstry, p. 5.

2. Vide *Throne* by Śrī K. R. Venkataraman, p. 57.

3. Vide *Śāraṅgā and Śaṅ. at Śrī.* by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā., p. 52.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

5. Vide *Throne* by Śrī K. R. Venkataraman, p. 54 (top).

no such clear description was thought of as necessary."¹ While answering the objection that the inscription of 1345 A. D. does not mention any Maṭha, he remarks that "the inscription of 1346 A. D. refers to Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha by name and begins with the invocation to Vidyātīrtha Guru."² But this is a tacit admission that there is no clear reference to a Maṭha at Śrīgerī.

Now, if we look into the epigraphs proper, we find that there is no reference to any mutt at Śrī. as has been said by many writers, though as said earlier, Mr. K. R. Venkatarāman tries to imply its prior existence by calling the 1346 A. D. inscription the first land-grant to the Śrī. Maṭha by king Hari. I. The reference is to सिंगेरीतीर्थे only and the grant is made to Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and his disciples to enable them to carry on their religious observances. This grant makes no mention of any Agrabhāra being established by Hari. I. The inscription of 1356 A. D., however, though it does not refer to any Maṭha at Śrī., does mention an Agrabhāra — renamed Śrīkanthapura — as having been given away by the king at the instance of his preceptor, to 30 brahmins well-versed in the Vedas (and not to any Maṭha).

Similarly, there is no reference anywhere in the epigraphs to Vidyātīrtha, Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha or Vidyāranya as being the head of the Mutt and this is particularly significant because Bhoganātha, the composer referred to in the inscription as the king's Minister-Chamberlain (नर्मसचिव) and the younger brother of Mādhava (= Vidyāranya after sannyaśa), refers to Mādhava only and neither to Vidyāranya nor to his having been the head of the Śrī. Maṭha. Nor are these three persons said to enjoy any special titles attached to the Śrī. Ācārya later. We find that both Bhārati Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha and Vidyāranya were initially called श्रीपादगुरु whereas Vidyātīrtha was Guru only. The inscription of 1356 A. D. does not contain these references while, as said just earlier, Mādhava only has been named as such, Vidyāranya is still श्रीपादगुरु only in the inscription of 1375 A. D. While in the inscription of 1377 A. D., he becomes श्रीमत्परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्य वेदमार्ग-प्रतिष्ठाचार्य, in that of 1378 A. D., he becomes पदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीण in, addition to all these titles. Finally, he becomes the supreme preceptor of the Emperor and has been bracketed with Kriyā. Śakti in 1384 A. D. Inscription.³

1-2. Vide *Śāraṅgā and Śaṅ.* at Śrī. by Śrī Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa, p. 53.

3. My comments in the two paragraphs on the Śrī. epigraphs are based on the Śrī. epigraphs as printed in *Uttarakalā Sanskrit Vidyāranya Epigraphs*, Vol. I 1985, published by Bhāratiya Vidyābhavana, Bombay 7.

On the contrary, there is a clear epigraphical evidence to show that the Kūḍali Mutt existed and received grants from 1155 A. D. while (Tuṅḡ) Śṛṅgerī did so only from 1346 A. D. onwards at the earliest. For this very reason, it is difficult to agree with Mr. Venkaṭa. that the original Guru of Kūḍali Śṛṅgerī was appointed by the Śṛṅ. Swamiji and that the first Ācārya of Kūḍali Mutt was Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī, also called Ammāji Swami.¹ The records that mention this Nṛsiṃha Bhāratī belong to 1546-1586 A. D., when this Mutt branched off. Ammāji Swami was the disciple of Rāmacandra Bhāratī, the head of the Śṛṅ. Mutt at that time. This places Kūḍali Śṛṅ. in the middle of the 16th cent. A. D., which does not seem to conform to facts.

Lastly, the name of the place is not Śṛṅgerī proper in the earlier stages. We have in fact a variety of words to denote the place such as सिंगतीर्थ, सिंगेरी, शृङ्गपुर, शृङ्गपुरी, (G. V. K — IV : 31, 33), शृङ्गनगरी (G. V. K. IV : 32) and then शृङ्गेरी. Regarding the name of the Maṭha proper, we shall say something under the next section.

In this connection, it may be noted that the two Agrahāras, Śṛṅga-pura and Vidyāraṇyapura, were constructed at Śṛṅ.² and it has been said to be probable that Śṛṅgapura was constructed in the name of Śṛṅgabhaṭṭa to commemorate his very close association with the place and also that it is very probably a natural corruption of Śṛṅgapura, founded in memory of Śṛṅgibhaṭṭa, the 13th pontiff of the Śṛṅgerī Mutt according to the *Gadyā-vallī*.³

It has been argued against this that the Agrahāra Śṛṅgerī was so named in memory of the sage Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, with whom the place has been associated from days of yore. It, however, seems more probable that the Agrahāra Śṛṅgapura was constructed more for Śṛṅgibhaṭṭa than for such an old person as Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and ultimately came to be known as Śṛṅgerī, particularly in view of the close association of Śṛṅgibhaṭṭa with Vidyāraṇya and the place now called Śṛṅgerī as well, both the Agrahāras being constructed and mentioned together and the other Agrahāra being undoubtedly in memory of Vidyāraṇya.⁴ The naming of the place after him is also quite probable unless

1. Vide *Throne* by Sri K. R. Venkataramna, p. 72.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

3. Vide *The Śṛṅ. Maṭha* by Sri B. Krishnan, p. 12.

4. It is not the Kumba. Mutt people or Sri Krishnan only who suggest the evolution or derivation of the name Śṛṅgerī from the name of the Agrahāra Śṛṅgapura, constructed in the memory and name of Śṛṅgi or Śṛṅgibhaṭṭa, as said by Śṛī Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa (p. 14, top and end). *The Mysore Archaeological Survey Report* of 1931 A. D. (pp. 14-19) also says exactly the same thing.

there is any evidence to show that the name Śringerī has come down through all these millennia or that the place was so named at any particular later time but much earlier than the time of Vidyāraṇya. At least the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki and the *Mahābhārata* do not seem to support the hypothesis of the name existing as Śringerī from very olden times. In fact, the connection of Śringerī with Rṣyaśṛṅga does not make much material difference to the Śrī. Mutt beyond that thereby, it becomes associated with a place of a hoary and hallowed antiquity.

All this discussion may not be conclusive but it is sufficient to show that if the position of the K. K. Mutt is not altogether beyond doubt, that of the (Tuṅgā) Śrī. Mutt is also similar and though it may be certain that Śaṅkara established a mutt at Śringerī, there is room for doubt as to where he did so — at Kūḍali Śrī. or Tuṅgā-Śrī. And, then, even though the supporters of the latter may say that the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt is just a branch of the Tuṅgā Śrī. mutt, which is principal, the balance of evidence seems to be tilted in favour of the Kūḍ. Śrī. Mutt.

The Maṭhāmāyās :

I have already said more than once that the Ś. V.s except 3 or 4 do not specifically refer to the four mutts as having been established by Śaṅ., and even the *Mādhaviya* does not refer to such a Mutt at Śringerī. The only authority for the establishment of the 4 Mutts — popularly called Āmnāya-Piṭhas — is the *Maṭhā.s.*, which say that Śaṅ. established 4 Āmnāyas in 4 directions. One of the epithets of Śaṅ. in the अष्टोत्तरशतनामावलि is the “establisher of Āmnāyas in the 4 directions (चतुर्दिक्चतुराग्नयप्रतिष्ठात्रे नमः No. 84) and this is supposed to support the *Maṭhā.* statement in regard to the 4 Āmnāya Piṭhas. We have a number of works going under the name Maṭhāmāyā though with variations in their names such as मठाग्नाय, मठाग्नाय-स्तोत्र, मठेतिवृत्त, मठानुशासन and so on. Now, none of these works makes even an indirect mention of any mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñci. And the critics of the K. Mutt have utilised this fact to counter its claim as the 5th mutt established by Śaṅ. at Kāñci. Their argument is that Śaṅ. established 4 Mutts or Āmnāya Piṭhas only and that he did not establish any 5th Mutt at Kāñci. Śrī Anantā-nendra Sarasvatī tries to argue that “in 4 directions” does not necessarily mean and refer to 4 Mutts only but that this is only its superficial meaning and that the correct meaning is “in all places” and not “in the four corners” only. He cites a passage from the *Chāndogya Up.*,¹ where Śaṅ.

1. The passage runs thus : सर्वतः आबसथान् मापयांचक्रे । सर्वत एव ते अन्नमश्नन्तु इति ॥ छान्दोग्य उप. Ch. IV — cited by Śrī Anantā. Saras. in his book *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.*, p. 64.

himself has interpreted the word सर्वतः to mean सर्वासु दिक्षु ग्रामेषु नगरेषु च ॥ He, therefore, concludes that "wherever we have 'in all directions' (सर्वासु दिक्षु), what is meant is 'in all places' and not 'in the four corners.'" This reasoning, however, is self-defeating for in the present case, the word used is चतुर्दिक् and not सर्वासु दिक्षु and it is quite obvious that चतुर् cannot be taken to be the same as सर्वतः or सर्वासु (दिक्षु). If, therefore, the *Maṭhāmnāyas* are to be accepted as reliable, they must be taken to favour 4 mutts in 4 corners only and not mutts in all directions. And this automatically excludes the 5th mutt at Kāñcī. Mr. Dave maintains this position firmly and so do the various scholars unanimously whose opinion on this point has been cited in the *JSMV*-1934.¹ Mr. R. G. Śarmā further points out that the *Maṭhāmnāyas* have been accepted by all the people and the courts also.²

Mr. Śarmā emphasises in this context the expression Āmnāya Maṭha and says that there is difference between an Āmnāya Maṭha and a residential (निवासी) Maṭha. According to him - and others also agree with him - an Āmnāya Maṭha is one which has a definite nomenclature of its own like सम्प्रदाय, क्षेत्र, तीर्थ, देवता, महावाक्य, योगपट्टक etc. while a residential mutt has none of these at all. It is a place where celibates, students, sannyāsins reside. The first has been given Āmnāya status by the founder while the second is not so invested. Secondly, the Āmnāya Maṭha functions as a religious centre, with the right of jurisdiction over a specific region or area, laid down by the founder while the residential mutt has no such right (*adhikāra*). Śarmā further distinguishes both these - Āmnāya mutt and an ordinary residential mutt - from a Pīṭha.³ According to him, "the abode of Devayonis is called a Pīṭha and is presided over by a Śakti like Kāmākṣī whereas an Āmnāya Mutt is presided over by a human being."⁴ He also argues that Kāma. Pīṭha was in existence long before Śāṅkara, and it cannot be equated with an Āmnāya Maṭha, which then could be said to have been established by Śāṅkara at Kāñcī.

The nett contention of Mr. Śarmā and of other critics is that the Kāñcī has no Āmnāya status as it has no nomenclature like सम्प्रदाय &c. In this connection, it has been pointed out that every one of the 4 recognised Mutts has a Maṭhāmnāya of its own while the K. K. Mutt has none and

1. Vide : (i) *Śrī Ācārya Śāṅkarācārya - his Mutts and Memorials* by M. S. Dave, pp. 27-29; (ii) *JSMV* (1934), pp. 54-57.
2. Vide *JSMV* pp. 302 etc.; (ii) *Myth* p. 23.
3. (i) *JSMV* p. 302 (आम्नाय मठ, साधारण मठ or पीठ का अंतर है। (bottom); (ii) *Ibid.* p. 137 (top); (iii) *Myth* pp. 22-23.
4. Vide *JSMV* p. 136 (middle).

the *Maṭhāmnāya Setu*, which is claimed by it to have been contained in and culled from the *Bṛhat Śaṅkara Vijaya* of Citsukha is altogether unreliable, particularly in view of the very tall claims it has made therein and that for this very reason, it cannot be attributed to Śaṅkara. Mr Śarmā sets aside opinion of some persons that these Maṭhāmnāyas were prepared by some one like Vidyāranya quite later. He maintains that they were written by Śaṅkara himself. He argues further that even if this point is conceded, it is quite clear that none of these Maṭhāmnāyas contains the slightest suggestion of a Mutt by Śaṅkara at Kāñcī, which shows that till such a late period also a mutt at Kāñcī was unknown to the writer of the same.¹

It has also been argued that all the factors about the Mutts, as mentioned in the *Maṭhās*, such as सम्प्रदाय, महा० and so on, are 4 only and as such, no fifth factor is left over for the K. Mutt. The योगपट्टक are ten and they have been distributed among the 4 Mutts, leaving none for the K. Mutt. All this shows that no such Mutt was founded by Śaṅkara and hence none existed at Kāñcī.²

Now, we have to concede that no extant Maṭhāmnāya text contains even a remote or indirect reference to K. Mutt, no matter whether it was written by Śaṅ. himself or by someone else like Vidyāranya later and yet this is not a sufficient ground for rejecting the K. Mutt as having been established by Śaṅ. We may concede the argument of Mr. Śarmā that the Globe Edition of Śaṅ.'s works, published by the Vani Vilas Press, Śrīraṅgam, is not exhaustive and that it contains Śaṅ.'s works on Advaita Vedānta only, and not his hymns, minor works (प्रकरणग्रन्थs) or his writings pertaining to the Maṭhāmnāyas.³ This by itself is, however, not sufficient to establish that Śaṅ. wrote the Maṭhāmnāyas. Not even one out of the 16 or 17 biographies of Śaṅ. (*Śaṅkara Vijayas*) contains even a remote or indirect reference to his having written a Maṭhā. for any Mutt, though they do mention his other works – the major ones principally – and this cannot be used to show that Śaṅkara may have written them, even as in the case of the Globe Edition. Regarding the *Maṭhā. Setu*, put up by the K. Mutt. it need not be accepted

1. Vide *JSMV* pp. 135 and 139 (first para.); *Myth* p. 33.

Mr. Śarmā repeats a number of times that the Maṭhā. was prepared and started by Śaṅkara himself and that the Āmnāya system also was prepared and started by him only. Vide pp. 134, 141, 301-302, 304-305, 309, 354, 391, 477 and so on.

2. For a detailed discussion of सम्प्रदाय, वेद, etc., and their application to the K. K. Mutt, vide in particular *JSMV* Pt. II, Ch. II, pp. 307-334. The critics seem to concentrate on वेद, महावाक्य and योगपट्टक only out of the different factors applicable to an आम्नायमठ.

3. Vide (i) *JSMV* p. 135 and (ii) *Śāradā and Śaṅ. at Śrī.* by Śrī Śaṅ. Nārā., p. 35.

so long as the *Bṛhad Śaṅkara Vijaya* is not available and we are not able to check it up with the original. Some of the contents of the same are also too presumptuous to have come from Śaṅ. himself. Yet, this does not compel us to accept the other Maṭhāmnāyas also as having come from Śaṅkara's pen.

Mr Śarmā's statement that *all* authoritative texts like *Mādhaviya* or that of Mr. Dave that *all* the biographies of Śaṅ. state unanimously that Śaṅ. established 4 Āmnāya Maṭhas only¹ is far from the truth. As pointed out earlier, not more than 2 or 4 Ś. V.s - and *Mādhaviya* is not one of them - mention the 4 Maṭhas at all and the Śrī. Mutt also has not been clearly mentioned even in the *Mādhaviya*. It has also been shown elsewhere that *Mādhaviya* is not at all so authoritative as Mr. Śarmā, Mr. Dave and *JSMV*. 1934 think it to be. Moreover, all this Āmnāya Maṭha business is altogether foreign to all the Ś. V.s and so is the Maṭhāmnāya business. There is not the slightest reference to anything like a Maṭhāmnāya or an Āmnāya Mutt even in a single Ś. V. Hence, the details like सम्प्रदाय, चार, तीर्थ, योग and so on are nowhere to be found in a single one of them. The obvious implication or conclusion is that these ideas must have sprung up much later and then codified into the Maṭhāmnāya texts by some person possibly Vidyāranya or someone else. That they were prepared or written out by Śaṅkara himself is altogether without any evidence, at least in the Ś. V.s.

Coming to the Maṭhāmnāyas proper, we find that those that we have today do not agree with one another. There are among them a number of variations, which cannot be easily set aside or dismissed as not being very material and they go against their validity. In the first place, we have the following Maṭhāmnāya texts :²

1. Vide (i) *Śrī Ādya Śaṅkarācārya - His Mutts and Memorials* by M. S. Dave, p. 26 (16); (ii) Puri Śaṅkarācārya's statement quoted in (a) *JSMV* p. 563; (b) *Myth* p. 40.
2. (1) मठाम्नायस्तोत्रम् -- (i) Vani Vilās Press (a) between 1954 and 1958 A. D.; (b) 1975 A. D., (ii) *Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and his Saṁpradāya* Sri Bodas, p. 88; (ii) *JSMV* p. 647.
- (2) मठाम्नायसेतु -- (i) *Śrī Śrī. etc.*, Sri Bodas, p. 83; (ii) *JSMV* p. 303, 648, 650. In the last, Mr. Śarmā refers to the सेतु as the कृति of Śaṅkara.
- (3) मठानुशासनम् -- (i) *JSMV* p. 651; (ii) Maṭhāmnāya from Adyar.
- (4) मठेतिवृत्तम् -- Quoted in parts in *The Traditional Age of Śaṅ. etc.* by Mr. Aiyer and Mr. Śāstrī, (1962), Ch. II : pp. 49, 51-52, 54-57; Ch. V : pp. 102, 110.
- (5) मठाम्नायोपनिषद् -- Given in *Parīṣiṣṭa* by *Saṅkṣipta-Śaṅkara-Digvijaya* by Swāmi Kālikācārya, who describes it in the colophon as 'seen' (दृष्ट) by Śaṅkara (*Parīṣiṣṭa* p. 2).

- (1) मठाग्नाय — All 4 मठाग्नायs given separately.
- (2) महानुशासनम् (3) जगद्गुरुरम्परा (with मठा० of गोवर्धनमठ).
- (4) श्रीमठाग्नाय — said to be from Br. S. V. of Citsukha and giving the 4 मठाग्नायs as पूर्वाम्नायाश्चत्वारः and then मुख्याग्नाय for the Kāñcī Maṭha.
- (5) मठाग्नायस्तोत्रम् — published by Vanī Vilās Press, Śrīraṅgam and also given by Bodas.
- (6) मठाग्नायसेतु — Bodas and J. S. M. V. of Mr. Śarmā.
- (7) श्रीमठाग्नायोपनिषद् given in संक्षिप्त शङ्करदिग्विजय by कालिकाचार्य स्वामी.
- (8) मठेतिवृत्ति — given in part by Mr. Aiyar and Mr. Sastri.

Firstly it will be found that the very names of the Maṭhāmnāya texts are different as shown above. The contents of these texts, though more or less common, ultimately suggest different particulars about the Maṭhas like वार, तीर्थ etc. with some important internal variations. Thus, the Vanī Vilās Press gives the name of the text as मठा० स्तोत्र only while Bodas and Śarmā refer to the मठा० सेतु as the work (कृति) of भगवत्पादशङ्कर. Kālikā Swāmi describes मठाग्नायोपनिषद् as 'seen' (दृष्ट) by Śaṅ. In the case of the Maṭhā. from Adyar, we are simply told that the मठा०s pertain to the different Maṭhas, established by Śaṅ. (शङ्कराचार्यप्रतिष्ठितशङ्केरी इ० मठाग्नायः). This मठाग्नाय along with महानुशासनम् is substantially the same as मठा० सेतु given by Mr. Śarmā. Curiously enough, this मठा० सेतु has 48 stanzas and Mr. Śarmā gives महानुशासनम् separately though most of the stanzas therein are found included in the मठा० सेतु, as given by him. Yet Mr. Śarmā remarks that this महानुशासन is in an incomplete form. It may be noted that st. 3 (विबुद्धार्थ etc.) in this महानुशासन of Mr. Śarmā is not found in the corresponding महानुशासन from Adyar.

Mr. Śarmā gives a second मठा० सेतु having 10 stanzas which appear to be a part of श्रीमठाग्नाय from the Adyar library and attributed to Citsukha's *Bṛhat Śaṅkara Vijaya*. This मठा० सेतु corresponds to stt. 35 to 43 with many variations and with one stanza less than the Adyar श्रीमठा०, from which the first 35 stanzas and st. 44 and onwards are absent in this मठा० सेतु.

Mr. Bodas gives the मठा० सेतु as given by Mr. Śarmā but does not give any महानुशासन separately. He gives stt. 28 to 31 and stt. 44-45 from श्रीमठा० from Adyar without giving the rest of the same.

Śrī Kālikā Swāmi gives a मठाग्नायोपनिषद्, not given by Mr. Śarmā or Mr. Bodas. This मठाग्नायोपनिषद् contains Maṭhāmnāya pertaining to 7

आम्नाय, which also are not given by others as also by Vāñi Vilās Press or Mr. K. R. Venkataraman.

मठेलिङ्ग, which is said to be Śringerī-sponsored, has been given by Mr. Aiyar and Mr. Śāstry only and nowhere else and that also in parts only. I have not seen the whole of this text.

Secondly, regarding the contents, we find that there are very important variations and they are in respect of 4 out of the 11 particulars. The 4 are Devī or Śakti, Ācārya, Maṭha-nāma and the Yogapaṭṭaka. These variations can be stated as follows :

(1) The Goddess (Devī or Śakti) of पूर्वाम्नाय has been given as Vimalā in मठा० सेतु (Jagadguru Śāṅkara Maṭha Vimarśa of Mr. Śarmā, pp. 643-650), Maṭhāmṇāya from Adyar and मठाम्नायोपनिषद् and as Vṛṣalā in आम्नायस्तोत्र and the Throne of Transcendental Wisdom (= Throne) by Śrī. K. R. Venkatārāman.

The Goddess of the Śringerī (Tuṅgā) Mutt has been given as Kāmākṣī in मठा० सेतु in JSMV of Mr. Śarmā, मठाम्नाय from Adyar and मठा० निषद् while it has been given as Śārādā in मठाम्नायस्तोत्र (Vāñi Vilās Press) of Śrī. Maṭha, श्रीमठाम्नाय from Bṛhat Śāṅkara Vijaya of Citsukha and the Throne.¹

(2) Curiously enough, the name of the (Tuṅgā) Śrī. Maṭha has been given as Śringerī Mutt by all the above three who give its Goddess as Kāmākṣī while it has been given as Śārādā by the आम्नायस्तोत्र (V. Vilāsa Press), श्रीमठाम्नाय of Cit. (Adyar) and the Throne. In the case of the latter three, the name Śārādā is repeated for the Maṭha and the Goddess² as well.

Again, the मठाम्नाय from Adyar, आम्नायस्तोत्र (V. V. Press) and श्रीमठाम्नाय (Cit.) give the name of उत्तराम्नाय as Śrīmaṭha while the other three give it as Jyotirmaṭha.

1. Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā. has tried to show how रामेश्वर and कामाक्षी are fully justified as the क्षेत्र and देवी or Goddess of the Śrī. Mutt and how कामाक्षी is the same as शारदा and hence there is no contradiction in either कामाक्षी or शारदा being said to be the Goddess of that Mutt (Śārādā and Śaṅ. at Śrī., pp. 39-40).

This is, however, just the opposite of the opinion of Mr. R. K. Iyer who says very clearly that Kāmākṣī and Tripurasundarī "are distinct aspects of the Divine mother and cannot be identified with Śārādā." (Truth p. 180). Or, are they different for the K. K. Mutt but identical for the Śrī. Mutt? I shall revert to this point later.

2. The GVK refers to the Śrī. Mutt as श्रीमठ at 5 places IX. 34, 35, 36, 51 and 67 and Gidvilāsa does so twice XXIV. 32, 54.

(3) The first Ācārya of the Dwārakā Maṭha (पश्चिमाम्नाय) is stated to be Viśvarūpa in मठांसेतु and मठाम्नाय from Adyar, as Padmapāda in मठाम्नायस्तोत्र (of Śrī. V. V. Press), श्रीमठाम्नाय of Cit. and the *Throne*, and as Brahmasvarūpācārya in मठांनिषत्. The Dwārakā mutt people identify Viśvarūpa with Sureśvara, who is then claimed as their first Ācārya while according to Sri T. S. N. Śāstry, Viśvarūpa was the brother of Maṇḍana Miśra and after initiation into Sannyāsa, he was renamed Brahmasvarūpācārya and appointed as the first Ācārya of the Dwārakā Maṭha.

The first Ācārya of the Govardhana Maṭha (पुरी - पूर्वाम्नाय) is said to be Padmapāda in मठां सेतु, मठाम्नाय from Adyar and मठाम्नायोपनिषत् and Hastāmalaka in मठाम्नायस्तोत्र (V. V. Press), श्रीमठाम्नाय of Cit. and the *Throne*.

The first Ācārya of the (Tuṅgā) Śrī. Mutt is said to be Prthivīdhava/dhara in मठांसेतु in J. S. M. V. of Mr. Śarmā, मठाम्नाय from Adyar and मठांनिषद्. Viśva in श्रीमठां of Cit. and Sureśvara in मठांस्तोत्र of शुं (V. V. Press) and the *Throne*. It may be pointed out that even like the Dwārakā Mutt, the Śrī. Mutt also identified Viśvarūpa with Sureśvara who was then said to be their first Ācārya. It may be noted here that according to the *Śaṅkara-vijayas*, Sureśvara was initiated by Śaṅkara into the महावाक्य तत्त्वमसि while the महावाक्य of the Śrīgerī Maṭha, according to all the मठाम्नाय, is अहं ब्रह्मासि ।

Lastly, regarding the योगपट्टक, there is a variation in the case of the (Tuṅgā) Śrī Maṭha only. Except मठाम्नायस्तोत्र (of Śrī., V. V. Press) and the *Throne*, who assign or claim all the योगपट्टक for the Śrī. Ācāryas, the remaining admit only three, viz. सरस्वती, भारती and पुरी for the said Ācārya.¹ A few words have to be said about these योगपट्टक.

In simple language, the *Yogapattakas* are the ten names enumerated in the following stanza :

तीर्थाश्रमवनारण्यगिरिपर्वतसागराः ।

सरस्वती भारती च पुरी नामानि वै दश ॥

These are known as दशनाम and the word दशनामी was originally used in conjunction with Nāga (naked) Sannyāsins. Later, one or the other of these came to be added to the new name given to a person when he was initiated into Sannyāsa. According to Dr. Jadunath Sarkar, this order of 10 names hails from a hoary past while Sri K. M. Munshi describes it as

1. Even Mr. Śarmā says that the Śrī. Mutt has three योगपट्टक only, viz. सरस्वती, भारती and पुरी, *Myth* p. 34 (end).

the oldest, the largest and the most effective of our monastic orders.¹ It is, however, definite that Śaṅkarācārya did not start it or utilise it for his Ācāryas of the Maṭhas established by him. Dr. Sarkar feels that "it is highly improbable that he (i. e. Śaṅ.) himself actually organised these orders ... it would be more correct to hold that Śaṅ. was the inspirer rather than the actual builder of the Daśanāmi order."² Mr. Śarmā also says that Śaṅ. only resuccitated the ten Yogapattakas.³ If, however, we look to the *Śaṅkara Vijayas*, we find that even like the concept of an Āmnāya Maṭha, as distinct from a residential Maṭha, the idea of a yogapattaka also is quite foreign to these. With regard to those yogapattakas, the following points deserve to be noted :

Except अम्नायस्तोत्र (or मठास्तोत्र of वृं. V. V. Press) which assigns to the Śrī. (Tuṅgā) Mutt, all the ten names i. e. Yoga.s, all the other मठा texts, viz. मठासेतु, मठेतिवृत्त, मठाविषय etc. assign to Śrī. (T.) Mutt three names only, viz. सरस्वती, भारती and पुरी. Why the Śrī. Mutt should have been singled out for this exceptional favour and that too by one मठा only belonging to the said mutt, is not explained. Perhaps, the reason is obvious. Even with regard to the limited names assigned to the 4 Maṭhas, we find that they have been hardly adhered to in actual practice.

Thus, Śrī. Mutt has सरस्वती, भारती and पुरी as its Yoga.s, to be added to the संन्यास names of its heads or Ācāryas. Actually, however, we find that the first 7 Ācāryas and Vidyāranya (No. 12) are without any of these three names or Yoga.s - in fact without any yogapattaka. Ācāryas 8 to 11 and 35 and 36 (Śrī Mahāsannidhānam and Śrī Sannidhānam) are तीर्थs, the last i. e. No. 36 being श्रीभारतीतीर्थ. Tīrtha property belongs to the Dwārakā Mutt. No. 5, 6 and 7 are Giris, but Giri belongs to the Jyotir Maṭha (North). Thus 15 out of 36 Ācāryas have no relation to the prescribed Yoga.s. The rest are all भारतीs, there being no सरस्वती, or पुरी at all. Thus, while claiming all the ten yoga.s, only three have been actually used for the Śrī. Mutt Ācāryas, two out of these three being outside the three allotted to them by the other मठाs than the मठास्तोत्र.

The Dwārakā Mutt has two titles, तीर्थ and आश्रम, but only 6 of its Ācāryas are तीर्थs and 36 have the title आश्रम, while the others have titles like पाद, गुरु, देशिक, रसिक, and सरस्वती (the last being one of the Yogapattakas of the Śrī. Mutt).

-
1. Vide *A History of Daśanāmī Nāga Samnyāsis* by Dr. J. Sarkar, Preface p. 2.
 2. *Ibid.* p. 50.
 3. Vide *JSMV* p. 308 (top).

The Govardhana Mutt has वन and अरण्य as its Yogapattakas but curiously enough, none of its Ācāryas has either of these added to their Sannyāsa names, the one used for them being तीर्थ, which belongs to the Dwāarakā Mutt.

The point here is as to whether we are going to reject these Maṭhas as not having been established by Śaṅkara just because of these discrepancies? The Kāñcī Mutt does not at least have these. That 'इन्द्रसरस्वती' claimed by the K. Mutt as their Yoga. is exclusive to the K. Mutt may be a wrong claim but the Yoga. cannot and need not now be argued against or criticised in view of what has been said above about some of the योगःs like तीर्थ.

It has been said that the Sannyāsins (in general) have only 10 titles added to their Sannyāsa-names but Mr. R. V. Iyer has devoted one full, though small, chapter (No. 12) to show how the title इन्द्रसरस्वती is shared by Sannyāsins outside the K. Mutt, to which, therefore, it is said to be not exclusive.¹ This shows that there is nothing sacrosanct about the 10 Yoga.s/ names only being added to the Sannyāsa names and that इन्द्रसरस्वती was also added to the संन्यास-names of many Sannyāsins, even though they were not the heads of any Śaṅ. Maṭha. It may be noted that the Puṣpagiri Maṭha also has some Ācāryas who have इन्द्रसरस्वती added to their Sannyāsa-names.

Mr. Śarmā points out that according to a work called *Yatidharma-nirṇaya*, इन्द्रसरस्वती and आनन्दसरस्वती सम्प्रदायः have come into existence on account of शीलाचारमताभिमान, that they are of quite a recent origin and did not exist at the time of Śaṅ.² because, he argues, if they had so existed,

1. Mr. Śarmā also gives many such names. Vide *JSMV* pp. 313-314 and *Myth* p. 38.
2. According to Mr. Śarmā, there was the योगपट्टक 'सरस्वती' only (he adduces no evidence for this) and no इन्द्रसरो or आनन्दसरो, which are of a later origin (*JSMV* p. 309).

Elsewhere, he says that some authoritative Ś. V.s mention सारती as Yoga. for Śaṅ. (*JSMV* p. 311 — he does not name the Ś. V.s). He also says that *Cid.ya* says that Śaṅ. was Bhārati (reference not given). He points out that according to the Ś. V. of Anantā., he made his own disciple as one pertaining to the Bhārati Sampradāya. (भारतीसम्प्रदायं निजशिष्यं चकार ।) ... Then he says that *Reṇukātāntra* also calls him Bhārati. He then remarks that in these circumstances, why he should take the योगपट्टक इन्द्रसरो is not clear. Similarly why should the Kumba. Mutt not take on the Yoga. Bhārati, if they belong to the unbroken line of Ācārya Śaṅ. ? (*JSMV* p. 311 last para).

Just as there is no evidence for Saras. being the only Yoga. in Śaṅ.'s time, there is no evidence in the Ś. V.s for Bhārati being the Yoga. of Śaṅ.

Śaṅ. would have definitely utilised them and included them in his own (स्वरचित) मठा. This is, however, hardly convincing because, as already shown the मठाग्रन्थाः did not emanate from Śaṅkara at all nor did he assign any Yoga.s to the Ācāryas appointed by him for the 4 Maṭhas. Wherever the Yoga.s in the मठा. are said to have been assigned to different Maṭhas, they are not shown to have been utilised at all. If they were assigned by Śaṅ, why were they not utilised? Why again certain Yoga.s assigned to a particular Maṭha, were utilised for Ācāryas of another Maṭha? The obvious conclusion, to my mind at least, is that Śaṅkara had nothing to do with these Yoga.s. That the Yogapattakas of the Maṭhas other than the K. Mutt, and even the Śrī. Mutt, are also not exclusive to them has been already shown.

The Mahāvākya

Regarding the question of the Mahāvākya of this Mutt, it has to be pointed out that as Śaṅ. himself was the first and foremost Ācārya of the Kāñci Mutt and as he himself was initiated into all the 4 Mahāvākyas by his Guru Govinda Muni, his successors were also initiated into all the 4 Mahāvākyas.¹ This was pointed out to me by H. H. Chandra Sekharendra Sarasvatī in 1957. It is really unfortunate that he did not give this explanation when he had gone to Kāñci in 1934 A. D. and was confronted with the question about the Mahā. of the K. Mutt. In the light of this, it is equally unfortunate that the Mahā. of the K. Mutt has also been stated to be प्रणव (श्रीमठा.) and as ॐ तत्सत् from the *Mahābhārata* which is regarded as the 5th Veda. It is such prevarication that has spoilt the case of the Kāñci Mutt.

Regarding Śaṅkara's 4 main disciples, we are told in the *Ś. V.*s about Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpa that after his initiation into Sannyāsa, he was

1. Mr. Śarmā refers to this practice at two places, viz. *JSMV* p. 327 and p. 334. His criticism of this practice is puerile at the first place. He argues that the initiation could obviously not be simultaneous and if it is into the 4 महावाक्य one after the other, in which order was it done? I think, any ordinary person can understand that Śaṅ. must have followed the order of the Mahā.s in which he himself was initiated into them by his own Guru. Alternatively, the initiating preceptor can well be presumed to be competent enough to decide the order. Mr. Śarmā need not be reminded that the *Mādhavīya* itself has referred to Śaṅ.'s initiation into all the 4 Mahā.s by his Guru Govinda Muni, for which read — ब्रह्मतामुपदिदेश चतुर्भिर्वेदशेखरवचोभिरमुष्मे । *S. S. Jaya*, V : 103.

(Vide also (i) *Śaṅkarābhyudaya* III. 2 to 4; (ii) *Cid.'s Ś. V. F.* IX. 19 and (iii) *Bhagavatpādābhyudaya* of Lakṣmana Sūri, III. 84-85; (iv) *Ś. D. Sūtra* by Sadā. Non mention of this fact by Śaṅ. in the *Maṭha.* is obviously due to the same not having been written by him.

initiated into one Mahāvākya only viz तत्त्वमसि.¹ The *Bhagavatpādābhya* by Laxmaṇa Śāstri (1927), the latest biographer, alone says that Sureśvara was initiated into all the 4 Mahāvākyas.² No *Śaṅkara Vijaya* tells anything about the Mahāvākya for the other disciples. Now, if, as pointed out earlier, Sureśvara is admitted to have been placed at the Śrī. Mutt, we find that its Mahāvākya is अहं ब्रह्मास्मि, Veda being *Yajurveda*, while तत्त्वमसि belongs to the *Sāmaveda* and to the Dwārakā Mutt. This discrepancy has not been touched upon by any of the 4 Kāñci Mutt critics.

Mr. Krishnan tries to point out two more variations, viz. देवता and क्षेत्र³ (the third, viz. शक्ति mentioned by him has been discussed already), According to him, all the Maṭhāmāyā texts except the Śrī. text mention Ādivarāha as the Devatā. However, as far as these texts have been available to me, even the Śrī. text mentions Varāha only as the Devatā. Moreover, if, according to Mr. Krishnan, Śrī. text is an exception in this respect, he should have mentioned the Devatā according to the same text but he has not done so.

Regarding the क्षेत्र, the variation रामक्षेत्र, pointed out by Mr. Krishnan as being mentioned in the Maṭhā. of Śrī, published by V. V. Press, is hardly different from Rāmeśvaram, mentioned in the other Maṭhāmāyās. And then all the long dissertation of Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan on how Rāmeśvaram legitimately belongs to the Śrī. Maṭhā⁴ becomes unnecessary. It is, however, true that scholars like Prof. B. Upadhyaya, Pandit Kasi Śeṣa V. Sastri, Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj and even Mr. Bodas have expressed their opinion that the Śaṅkarite institution for the South should have existed at Rāmeśvaram in the southern sacred corner of India. It is also worth noting that the क्षेत्र, देवी and तीर्थ of the Śrī. Maṭha should be at three distant places, the actual Maṭha being at a 4th place. In the case of the other Maṭhas (even including the K. Mutt), all the particulars are found to be almost at the same place. Mr. Śaṅkaranārāyaṇan's charge, however, that Mr. Krishnan has tried to identify the Dakṣiṇāmāyā Maṭha as the Kāñci Maṭha⁵ is not quite clear because he does not appear to have said so anywhere in his book.

-
1. Vide (i) Mād. X. 75; (ii) Rāja. D. II. 51; (iii) Sadā. IX. 3; (iv) Vyā. VI. 104; The first three say तत्त्वमसीति वाक्यम् while Vyā. Says तदादिवाक्यम् ।
 2. Vide *Bhagavatpādābhudaya* Laxmaṇa Sūri, VII. 71.
 3. Vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* B. Krishnan, p. 23.
 4. Vide *Śārada and Śaṅ. at Śrī.* by Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā., Ch. IV, pp. 36-40.
 5. *Ibid.* p. 38.

Even if we look to the language, particularly of the मठास्तोत्र of the Śrī. Mutt proper, published by V. V. Press, we find that it must have been written later by someone other than Śaṅkara. Thus चतुरोऽथ मठान् ... संस्थापय-
द्विभुः १. (st. 1), चकार संज्ञामाचार्यश्चतुर्णाम् &c. (st. 2), सत्प्रदायं ... एवं प्रकल्पयामास ...
(st. 3) and lastly, इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकभूषतेः ॥ (st. 21) and आम्नायस्तोत्र-
पठनात् etc. (st. 22) – all this language cannot be ascribed to Śaṅkara himself
who is very clearly being referred to by someone else later as the author
of the writing, so that the same may be invested with the mark of autho-
rity. Even in the मठासेतु, the last stanza, No. 48,¹ clearly smacks of self-
glorification, which ill-agrees with the image of Śaṅ. In this stanza, the
author refers to himself as the representative of the Kali Age, on a par
with Brahmā in Kṛta Age and so on.

Moreover, if the Maṭhāmnāyas have to be ascribed to Śaṅ., are we
to suppose that all the Maṭhāmnāyas available under that name, were
written by him only? If so, the Maṭhāmnāyas of maṭhas like Puṣpagiri and
Virūpākṣa, which are said to be branches of the Śrī. Mutt, also will have
to be ascribed to him but we know for certain that these Maṭhas have come
after the 14th cent. A. D.

Mr. R. G. Śarmā says that certain High Courts have accepted the
Maṭhāmnāya as an authoritative book and quotes from the judgment of
the Patna High Court.² The quotation, however, does not bear out his
contention because it says only that “the Maṭhā. is, however, accepted as
authoritative by the Hindus.” This does not mean that the Court also
accepts it as authoritative and even if it does, the evidence produced so far
disproves the judgment.

Mr. Krishnan, on the contrary, has quoted from the judgment of
two British Judges – Basil Scott and Justice Bachelor – both of the Bombay
High Court, who say clearly in so many words that “Maṭhāmnāyas could
not have come from Śaṅ.” and that “there is no authoritative version of the
Maṭhāmnāya” and that different versions of it differ in material parti-
culars.³

1. Read : कृते विश्वगुरुर्ब्रह्मा त्रेतायामृषिसत्तमः । द्वापरे व्यास एव स्वात्कलावत्र भवाम्यहम् ॥

2. Vide *Myth* p. 33.

3. Vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* by Mr. B. Krishnan, p. 21. Mr. Krishnan also quotes
from a book *A tradition of teachers : Śaṅ. and the Jagadgurus [of today]* by
Mr. William Cenkener (Motilal Banarsidass, 1983-84) to the effect that “the
ancient texts dealing with the institutions, called Maṭhāmnāyas, date from
the post-Śaṅ. period — they are inconclusive.” (p. 109).

Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa, while trying to counter the argument of Mr. Krishnan, repeats the quotation from the Patnā High Court judgment and adds three more, one of them being from the judgment of Justice Scott. He himself concedes that Scott doubts Śaṅkara's authorship of Maṭhā,¹ while the other two once again do not allow us to conclude that they have accepted Śaṅkara's authorship of the Maṭhāmnāya. About the opinions of judicial authorities and eminent scholars in India, I shall say more at the end of this writing.

Mr. Krishnan's charge that the Maṭhāmnāya texts have been changed by the Śrī (Tuṅgā) Mutt to suit its own purpose² has been answered already. However, there seems to be some truth in his other charge that till about the middle of the present century, the authorities of the Śringerī Maṭha did not come out to openly proclaim their Maṭha as the Dakṣiṇāmnāya Maṭha or the one founded by Śaṅ. for the Southern regions³ and that the said claim "has been gradually pushed to the front by alterations in the Maṭha's original traditional Birudāvali." To prove his point, he has produced photostat copies of 4 Śrīmukhas of the Śringerī Maṭha of different times. The alterations said to have been made, particularly in the fourth one, are as follows :⁴

(1) The word शंकराचार्य has been inserted before the words गुरुपरम्पराप्राप्त in line 3 (No. IV).

(2) The words दक्षिणस्यां दिशि have been added in line 14 under the seal i. e. from the beginning. They are not found in any of the other three produced here.

(3) In recent publications, the दक्षिणाम्नाय पीठ, signifying 'Institution for the South' has been found printed.

A few more may be noted as follows :

(1) There is a deliberate reference to 4 Maṭhas established by Śaṅkara in 4 different directions.

(2) The topographical details of the particular Maṭha established in the southern direction.

1. Vide *Śāradaṁ and Śaṅ. at Śrī.* by Sri Śaṅ. Nārā, pp. 33-35.

2. Vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* by Mr. B. Krishnan, p. 23.

3. Mr. Śarma says positively that all authoritative works like *Ś. P.s* (प्रामाणिक शंकरविजयादि ग्रंथ *JSMV* p. 307) mention Śringerī as the दक्षिणाम्नाय मठ. As usual he gives specific names of the works while it is to be noted that not even a single *Ś. P.* makes such a mention.

4. Vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* by Mr. B. Krishnan, Ch. IV, pp. 24-28.

(3) There is a specific reference to the Śāradā Pīṭha occupied by the ruling Adhipati Swāmiji of the Śrī. Maṭha and the daily worship of Sri Śāradā and Candramaulīśvara.

(4) There is a reference to the temporal as well as spiritual welfare of all the people residing in India from the Himālayas to Rāmeśvara.

None of these 7 – three and four references – are to be found in any of the three Śrīmukha Bīrudāvalis. Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa tries to explain and also justify some of these additions as follows :

(i) In olden times, there was no necessity ... for putting forth clear Bīrudāvalis as the word शङ्कराचार्य denoted only the Śrī. Ācārya. But when a large amount of confusion was created by a few branch mutts which cropped up in the 19th cent. A. D., ... claiming their origin direct from Śaṅ., ... the titles had to be emphasised in view of the mischievous propaganda and hence the insertion of words श्रीशङ्कराचार्य-गुरु-परंपराप्राप्त in the Bīrudāvalis.¹

Now, firstly, it is not clear what Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa means by the very first statement. Even leaving out the K. K. Mutt, were the Śaṅkarācāryas of the other three mutts not denoted by the word शङ्कराचार्य ? It is indeed a preposterous claim on the part of Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa.

Secondly, if the branch mutts cropped up in the 19th cent. and created confusion, why is it not sought to be countered by the first three out of the 4 Bīrudāvalis quoted by Mr. Krishnan, when all these three belong to the 20th cent. It is the 4th Bīrudāvali alone, pertaining to the tenure of Sri Abhi. Vidyārtirtha Swāmigal (1954-1989) that contains all the changes noted above. Were the earlier Ācāryas not alive to the necessity referred to by Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa ?

(ii) According to Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa, there is a difference in material in the two Śrīmukha letters – Nos. 3 and 4. In the first, the Ācārya just blesses the author of the book while the latter is a Vyāsapūjā message. He, therefore, remarks that “this is the author’s mischievous and improper comparison.”²

Even this comment of Mr. Śaṅkara Nārāyaṇa is not tenable. In the first place, the word श्रीशङ्कराचार्य is a part of the Bīrudāvali proper, and not of the Vyāsapūjā message. Secondly, this Śrīmukha also contains a blessing to another person Mr. V. R. Subramanya Śarmā. Thirdly, the entire paragraph following the blessings contains certain statements regard-

1. Vide Śāradā and Śaṅ. at Śrī. by Sri Śaṅ. Nārā., p. 40.

2. Ibid. pp. 40-41.

ing the 4 Maṭhas established by Śaṅ., with special emphasis on the Śrī. Śāradā mutt, which holds jurisdiction from the Himālayas to Rāmasetu and which is said to carry on worship of Śrī Śāradā and Śrī Candramaulīśvara Liṅga every day. All this can hardly be said to be any Vyāsapūjā message. On the contrary, the deliberate attempt to emphasise certain particulars about the member of mutts in general and the Śrī. Mutt in particular is very clear and cannot be denied by any unprejudiced reader. Lastly, when the Maṭhā. itself demarcates the jurisdictions of the 4 different Mutts, how can this Birudāvali or Vyāsapūjā message be justified in spreading its own over the whole of India? This is clear contravention of the Maṭhā. which the Śrī. Mutt holds so dear, sacred and authoritative. I shall have occasion to revert to this matter towards the end of this discussion.

One more point deserves to be noted here.

At least three important and responsible supporters of the Śrī. (Tuṅgā) Maṭha say in so many words that that is "the first and the foremost Maṭha" established by Śaṅ.¹ Firstly, that Śrī. Maṭha was the first Maṭha founded by Śaṅ. is against the Maṭhāmnāya texts. मठास्तोत्र of Śrīngerī refers to that (Śrī.) Maṭha as Turiya i. e. the 4th Maṭha and describes it last, only after describing the other three. Similar is the case with the Maṭhā. Setu, which describes it last and calls it चतुर्थे i. e. the 4th Maṭha. Even Citsukha, according to Mr. T. S. Nara. Śāstri, has mentioned the Śrī. Maṭha as the 4th in order of establishment. If Śrī. Maṭha was established first, the other Maṭhas must have been established afterwards. As said earlier, however, not more than 3 or 4 out of about 17 Śaṅkara-Vijayas mention the establishment of any of these three other Maṭhas but in the course of his itinerary in India, the order of its stages being different in different Śaṅkara-Vijayas, Śaṅkara is said to have visited Dwārakā again (if, at all, he had visited it once earlier) only by 4 persons and Jagannāthapurī only by two persons and yet none of them says that he established a Maṭha at either of these places. All this does not seem to favour the establishment of the other three Maṭhas after that of the one at Śrīngerī. On the contrary, the order of Maṭhas, viz. Dwārakā, Himālayas, Purī and Śrīngerī given by Citsukha, appears to be more natural and reasonable.

Secondly, what is the authority for saying that the Śrī. Maṭha was the foremost, particularly when this Maṭha itself counters a similar claim of the Kāñcī mutt, and firmly and insistently maintains that all the Maṭhas

1. Vide (i) *Throne* (1990), p. 2; (ii) *Greatness* (1991), Intro. p. 6; (iii) *Śāradā & Śaṅ. at Śrī.*, Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā. p. 16; (iv) *Śrīngerī*, Tattvaloka Publication, p. 71 (first Maṭha).

founded by Śaṅkara were on an equal footing and none was superior to any other ? Besides, this is not in conformity with the contents of the Maṭhāmnāya texts either.

All the pieces of evidence adduced and the arguments put forward so far only go to show that the Maṭhāmnāyas could not have been written by Śaṅkara himself, and that they must have come much later and hence cannot be accepted as authoritative for deciding the number of Mutts established by Śaṅkara or more specifically, whether or not Śaṅ. established a mutt at Kāñcī also. Why the Maṭhāmnāyas avoided to mention or did not notice the Kāñcī Mutt when they came to be prepared is beyond what I can say. Regarding the *Mādhavīya*, one of the two works held as authoritative by the Śrī. Maṭha and/or its supporters, I have said enough already.

Court Cases

Now, if we look to the various court-cases, in which the Tuṅgā Śrīgerī Mutt has been involved either as appellant or as respondent, (the other party to the suit being some Śaṅ. mutt only – though not necessarily founded by Śaṅ. himself), we find that the contention of the T. Śrī. Maṭha has been negatived almost every time. As the other party to these suits, we have the Śīvagāṅgā Mutt, Virūpākṣa Mutt, Kūḍali Śrīgerī Mutt and most particularly the Kāñcī or Kumba. Mutt. In these cases, we see a manifest motive and attempt on the part of the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt to assert its supremacy over the other Mutts, particularly the Kūḍali Śrī. Mutt and the K. K. Mutt, both of which they called Tuṇḍu i. e. branch or subordinate mutts – branches of their own i. e. Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt. Unfortunately, they seem to have failed in their attempts to do so.

(1) The Śīva Gaṅgā Mutt (= ŚGM) was established in about 1615 A. D. at Śīvagāṅgā (near Bangalore) by an ascetic Śaṅkara Bhāratī, at the instance of Rājī Wodeyar, the then ruler of Mysore. The spiritual jurisdiction of this new Mutt extended all over the Kaṇṇāṭaka country, governed by the ruler of Mysore. The Maṭha was brought into existence at the request and under the auspices of the Mysore princes. According to a *sanad* of Śāka 1695 = 1773 A. D. to the Swami, "travelling over the country and exercising spiritual jurisdiction among the inhabitants entirely belonged to the Śīva Mutt". The Mutt rose in influence and power so much that during the period 1767 A. D. to 1817 A. D., the influence of the Śrī. (Tuṅgā) Mutt also was overshadowed by the energy, foresight and personal ability of the Śīva. Mutt Swamijis. But Narasimha Bhāratī IV, who became the head of the Śrī. (T.) Mutt in 1817 A. D. and ruled upto 1879 A. D., became a formidable rival and by his activity and policy

restored the Śringerī Mutt to its former proud position.¹ It was during his reign that the Śrī. Mutt objected to certain rights and privileges enjoyed by the ŚGM – particularly of moving about with honours like going in Addā. pālaki and receiving or collecting presents etc. Both the Mutts – Śringerī and Śivagaṅgā – had to approach the Mahārāja of Mysore for settling their dispute and after hearing both the sides, the Mahārāja passed orders on 10. 6. 1831 that the ŚGM should enjoy the same rights and privileges as were enjoyed by the Śringerī Mutt and that the Śringerī Mutt had no right to consider themselves superior to the ŚGM. This document is still said to be safe in the custody of ŚGM.²

As a matter of fact, the Śivagaṅgā Mutt and the Avani Mutt were sending annual contributions to the Kūḍali Mutt.³ If this is true, it is not understood how the ŚGM could be a branch of the Śrī. (T.) Mutt or be subordinate to it. In fact, as per the *Nibandhana Patrikā*, even the Śrī. (T.) Mutt was to send – and has actually sent – accounts and even amounts to the Kūḍali Śringerī Mutt.

Later on, however, the agents to the (T.) Śrī. Mutt became very active and many of the important places under the direct spiritual control of the ŚGM were acquired by the other Mutts, notably by the Śringerī Mutt.⁴

Similarly during the reign of Sri Subramanya Swāmī of the ŚGM, the Śrī. Mutt people, through the influence of K. Sheshadri Iyer, the then Dewan of Mysore, and by taking advantage of the weakness of Śiva. activities and youth of the Swamiji, managed to get the Govt. to deprive the ŚGM of those privileges, which were granted to the mutt through so many Rahadāri Sanads and thus, had been acknowledged as lawful and permitted by the successive rulers of Mysore, to be exercised by it i. e. the ŚGM.⁵

Mr. K. R. Venkataraman tells us that Rājā Wodeyar, who ascended the throne of Mysore in 1578 A. D., requested Śrī Abhinava Narasimha Bhāratī, the 24th Swamiji of (T.) Śringerī to establish a Mutt within his dominions. The Ācārya then deputed one of his disciples Śaṅkara Bhāratī to

-
1. For all this information about the Śiva. Mutt, vide *History of Śiva-Mutt* by Sri B. Sūryanarayan. Rao, 1914, pp. 56-73.
 2. *Ibid.* pp. 67-70 and *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras. p. 118.
 3. Vide *Śrī. Śaṅ. ya* etc. by Śrī Anantā. Saras., p. 92 (para 3 end).
 4. *History of Śiva. Mutt* by Sri B. Sūryanarayan Rao, p. 71.
 5. *Ibid.* pp. 81-83 and *Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Inst.*, Anantā Saras. p. 137, last para.
For Rahadāri Sanads, granted to the Śiva. Swamy, vide *History of Śiva. Mutt*, B. Sūryanarayan Rao, Ch. VIII. p. 70.

establish the new branch Mutt at Śivagaṅgā, being pleased with "the ideal location" of the place.¹

One trait of Mr. K. R. Venkataraman's account is his attempt to bring out the precedence of the Śrī. Mutt over the ŚGM. He refers to two visits to the ŚGM—one by the Śringerī Ācārya, viz. Śrī Saccidānanda Bhāratī III (1770–1814 A. D.) and another, on 15. 6. 1962, by the then Ācārya of Śrī. Mutt (i. e. Śrī Abhinava Vidyā Tīrtha — 1954 to 1989 A. D.).² The ŚGM Souvenir of 1964, however, refers to the second only of the two visits and describes it as "a recent event of great importance, viz. the first ever visit paid to ŚGM by the Jagadguru of Śrī Śrī. Mutt".³ Again, he refers to an order passed in 1806 (A. D.), by the regent to Mādhava Rāya, Subedar of Bangalore, only after consulting the Śrī. Jagadguru.⁴ (The order pertained to the relative claims of the Śrī. Mutt and ŚGM to Agra-pūjā.). He, however, studiously avoids all references to the jurisdiction initially enjoyed by the ŚGM all over Kārṇāṭaka and various privileges given to it earlier by the Mahārājas of Mysore through Rahadāri Sanads from time to time and particularly to the document of 19. 6. 1831 A.D., which was a decision very much against the Śrī. Mutt and the subsequent loss of its privileges by the Śivagaṅgā Mutt on account of the activities of the Śrī. Mutt, culminating in the compromise which the Śiva. Mutt Ācārya Śrī Subramanya Swamī had perforce to make with the Śrī. Swāmiji, just because "the activity and influence of the Śrī. agents were found to be more than a match for ... those of Śiva."⁵ and also because the (Śiva.) guru was young and new and "valuable documents on which Śiva, had to depend for its successful defence, were concealed by parties dictated by self-interest, greed and feeling".⁶ Mr. B. S. Rao remarks, "the agents of the Śrī. Mutt were everywhere active in furthering its interests and causing desertions to that Mutt from among the disciples of the Śiva.

1. Vide *Śivagaṅgā Mutt* by Sri K. R. Venkaṭa, 1969, p. 12.

One wonders whether it is not possible to suggest that Nṛ. Bhā. of Kūḍali Mutt (1599–1628 A. D.) could not have done this work. The Ācārya at Tuṅga Śrī. Mutt was Abhi. Nṛ. Bhā. (1600 A. D. to 1623 A. D. or 1599 A. D. to 1622 A. D.) and not Nṛ. Bhā. The Śiva. Mutt was founded in about 1615 A. D.

2. Vide *Śiva. Mutt* by Sri K. R. Venkaṭa, p. 23.

3. Vide *Śrī. Śrī. Śiva. Samsthānam Kumbhābhīṣekam Souvenir*, 1964, p. 3 (English section).

4. Vide *Śiva. Mutt* by Sri K. R. Venkaṭa., p. 15.

5. Vide *History of Śiva Mutt* by Sri B. Sūrya. Rao, pp. 81–92.

6. *Ibid.* p. 82.

Mutt. The object of Śringerī was apparently to absorb the spiritual jurisdiction of Śiva, to its own, treat the Swāmi as a disciple and keep him on a small monthly allowance so that its extensive revenues and estates may be appropriated to its own purposes."¹ Mr. Venkataraman simply ignores this aspect of the relationship between the Śivagaṅgā and Śringerī Mutts, as if it did not exist at all.

(2) The Virūpākṣa Mutt is said to have been established by Śrī Vidyāranya, the first Ācārya thereof having been appointed in 1302 A. D.² In 1863 A. D., the Śringerī Mutt filed a suit in Nizam's High Court against the Virūpākṣa Mutt, stating that the said mutt was touring in those parts and was collecting presents etc. from the disciples there, contending that it had no right to do so. Even this case was decided against the Śringerī Mutt by the said Court, which not only rejected the evidence submitted by that Mutt, declaring the documents produced by the Śrī. Vakil unreliable but also observed that the Śrī. Saṁsthāna had not visited the country for years together, neither did it ever perform the Amṛthi ceremony with the disciples nor collected from them any fee due to a Guru. The agent of the Śrī. Saṁsthāna is also not stationed anywhere there. On the contrary, enquiry revealed that the Virūpākṣa Saṁsthāna visited that country, that the yearly mamuls were paid to them, that the people in that district were acquainted with the Virūpākṣa Saṁsthāna only for years and that the agents of the mutt were posted in Hyderabad city and other Taluks. The Court, therefore, gave the verdict that the Śrī. Mutt should give up all its claims regarding mamuls of Guruship and that the Virū. Mutt should continue to impart religious instruction to its disciples, tour the country and that no one should interfere with that Saṁsthāna.³

(3) The relationship between the Kūḍali Śringerī and Tuṅgā. Śrī. Mutts has been outlined already and reference has also been made to the Tuṅgā Śringerī Mutt being restrained on two occasions from going in Adda-palaki and so on, on account of an agreement between the Swāmijis of the two mutts and also to the suit filed by the Śrī. Mutt against the Kūḍali Mutt but which was decided against the Śrī. Mutt and in favour of the Kūḍali Mutt. Thus, the suit was filed thrice in the Court and decided against

1. *Ibid.* p. 75.

2. Vide *The Śrī. Mutt* by Śrī B. Krishnan, p. 41 (para 3).

3. *Ibid.* pp. 41-42 and *Śrī Śaṁ. and Śaṁ. Inst.* by Sri Ananta. Saras. pp. 139-140. Vide the order in the case dated 15-6-1863 A.D. and also जगद्गुरुश्रीविरूपाक्ष-पीठचरित्र by Sri M. V. Śāstri, 1904, pp. 62-63.

the Śrī. Mutt and in favour of Kūḍali Mutt.¹ Was this due to Kumbakonam tactics or the influence of Tanjore or some other king?

Kāñci Kāmakoti or Kumbakonam Mutt

The greatest rival of Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt and also other mutts like Dwārakā and Purī, is the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt or the Kumba. Mutt, as the Śringerī people in particular repeatedly choose to call it. The disputes between the Tuṅgā Śrī. Mutt and the K. K. Mutt—even like the other Mutts—began, as said earlier, after Narasimha Bhārati (1817-1879 A. D.) became the Pīṭhādhipati at the Tuṅgā Śringerī mutt. A brief notice of these disputes with the K. K. Mutt will be helpful in understanding the tangle.

(1) In 1829 A. D., about 200 residents of Madurai (अशेषविद्वाद् महाजन of हायस्य) executed a निबन्धनपत्रिका in favour of the K. K. Mutt Ācārya, stating that they would be offering अग्रसेनावना etc. to the K. K. Mutt. In 1874 A. D., the Śringerī Ācārya, as it were to counteract this, got a similar Patrikā in his favour.

(2) In 1837 A. D., Śrī Nṛsimha Bhārati, Swāmī of Śringerī Mutt, went to Kumba. for participating in the Mahāmāgham festival. The authorities of the Śrī. Mutt desired to take His Holiness i. e. Śrī. Swāmiji in procession with all paraphernalia along all the streets in which branch mutts of Vaiṣṇava, Śaiya and other religious heads were situated and particularly through the Maṭha street in which the Kāma. or Kumbha. Mutt was situated. They, accordingly, applied to the joint magistrate for permission. The heads of the other Mutts filed their own statements against this, saying that according to convention, no head of any Mutt except that of K. K. Mutt could go in procession along any street where any Mutt was situated and that the breaking of this age-old custom would lead to breach of peace. The Govt. consequently rejected the permission to the Śrī. Mutt and decreed that this procession could go along a route fixed by the Govt. itself. Thus, the attempt of the Śringerī Mutt to establish its supremacy ended in failure.

(3) In 1838, the same Śrī. Ācārya went to Tiruchirapalli and tried to get अग्रसेनावना from the residents of some villages in the district. These residents, however, considered themselves to be the disciples of the K. K. Mutt and hence approached the District Collector in the matter and finally,

1. Vide *The Śrī Maṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, pp. 38-39 and *Śrī Śāh. and Śāh. Inst.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras., p. 141.

he passed orders prohibiting the exercise of such an influence (getting अग्रसंभावना etc.) by the Śrī. Mutt.¹

(4) *Tāṭaṅka-Pratiṣṭhā of 1844 A. D.* — In 1844 A. D., a suit No. 95 (or 96) of 1844 was filed in the Court of the Principal Sadar Amin, Trichinopoly by the Śrī. Mutt through its agents (or by the powered agents of the Śrī. Mutt) against the Kāmakoti Pīṭha Ācārya and others contending that the Śrī. Mutt Ācārya alone had the privilege of repairing or fixing the Tāṭaṅkas (ear-ornaments) of the Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī in the Tiruvanaikoil Temple and that Abhinava Saccidānanda Bhārati of the Śrī. Mutt, who had gone on pilgrimage to Rāmeśvaram about 80 years ago, had renovated the said Tāṭaṅkas. The Śrīgerī Ācārya prayed for an injunction, restraining the Kāma. Mutt Ācārya from repairing and reconsecrating the Tāṭaṅkas, alleging that the so-called Śaṅ. of Kāma. Mutt was no Śaṅ. at all and that Ādi. Śaṅ. did not establish the Kāma-Pīṭha. Almost all the arguments, which are now being advanced to denigrate the Kāma. Pīṭha (or Mutt), were then put forward before the Court.

After examining 13 witnesses and the documents adduced on behalf of the Plaintiff (i. e. Śrī. Mutt Ācārya) and 16 witnesses and documents on behalf of the first defendant (i. e. Kāma. Ācārya), the Court dismissed the suit saying that "the plaintiff has totally failed to prove its sole right to repair the ear-ornaments of the idol." Mr. Krishnan says that the judge declared that "the plaintiff (Śrī. Mutt) could not prove that it had any right to repair and reconsecrate the Tāṭaṅkas ...".

Against this judgment, the Śrīgerī Mutt made an appeal (No. 104 of 1846) in the Civil Court of Trichinopoly but it was also dismissed on 12th Jan. 1848, by the Court, which observed as follows: "The Court cannot close the case without remarking on the evidence adduced by the appellant to prove the actual reparation of the ear-ornament by the Śrī. Swamiyar in 1757 A. D. (some 80 - actually 87 years ago). In the strictures on the evidence of the Appellant's first and 13th witnesses on this point, by the President Sadar Amin, this court fully concurs. That they were both eye-witnesses to the reparation is highly improbable and as regards the first witness, he is utterly false for the reasons assigned by the Prin. Sadar Amin."

A special appeal petition No. 106 of 1848 in the Sadar Adalat Court, Madras, filed by the Śrīgerī Mutt against the appellate judgment was also

1. For the three cases, vide (i) *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śrī. Inst.* by Sri. A. Saras. p. 140 (all three cases); (ii) *The Śrī. Mutt* by Sri B. Krishnan, p. 39 (the second case and *Śrī Śaṅ. and the mutts* etc. by Sri K. Nilakantha, pp. 2-3.

dismissed on September 11, 1848. A further petition (C. M. P. No. 398 of 1848) in the Sadar Adalat Court to reconsider the order of Sept. 11, 1848 was also dismissed on Oct. 13, 1848.¹ Ultimately, the Kāma. Ācārya performed the ceremony of repairing and/or recossecrating the Tātañkas of the Goddess.

Mr. R. G. Śarmā has a different story to tell about this Tātañka Pratiṣṭhā case of 1844 A.D. It is as follows :

Some members of the Managing Committee (i.e. Trustees) of the Akhilāṇḍeśvarī Temple and a few well-known citizens of the city of Trichinopoly requested the then Śringerī Maṭha Ācārya to renovate and instal the Tātañkas of the Akhilāṇḍeśvarī Devī. On past occasions also, the Śrī. Ācārya had done so (he does not say when he had done so). The Śrī. Ācārya agreed and even as preparations for the ceremony were afoot, some of the temple-trustees were removed and some made to retire, to be replaced by new ones, who were appointed after selection. Then, with the help of two or three new trustees and with the help of the patronage of the Tanjore king, the Kumbha. Mutt managed to get the other trustees to approach the Kumbha. Ācārya for renovating the said Tātañkas. "Rumours and gossips then and now convey the details of the intrigues played by the Kumbha. Mutt." How it was manipulated to get the approval of the new trustees and the Collector of Trichy is not known, but the Collector rescinded the old order and issued a new one, requesting the Kumbha. Ācārya to repair the Tātañkas. The Collector did so without making any further inquiries in the matter. A copy of the (Collector's) letter is still available, says Mr. Śarmā.

When this matter became public, one Śrī Śeṣa Joshier (Agent of the Śrī. Maṭha) filed a case in the Court requesting it to cancel the new order of the temple-trustees with the endorsement of the Collector, and to confirm the previous one in favour of the Śringerī Ācārya. The Court then framed the issue in the case as follows : 'Who has the exclusive and absolute authority or right to renovate and instal the Tātañka?' Mr. Śarmā repeatedly maintains that at no stage of the case, the status, the origin or the establishment of the Maṭhas and by whom they were established was an issue framed or discussed. The Kumbakoṇam Maṭha filed rejoinders and statements, supporting all their false and untenable claims with a view to the future.

1. For this case account, vide (i) *Śrī Śāñ. and Śāñ. Inst.* by Śrī A. Saras. pp. 141-142; (ii) *The Śrī Maṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, p. 40; (iii) *Śrī Śāñ. and the Mutts etc.* by Śrī K. Nilakanthan, p. 3.

The Petitioner Agent of the Śrī. Maṭha, Mr. Śeṣa Joshier, stated in the petition that he had filed all the documents in his possession and had called for other relevant ones from the Śrī. Maṭha. He then asked for a postponement of the case till the Śrī. Ācārya, then on a tour, returned and filed the other papers. However, the postponement was not granted and Mr. Joshier was asked to prove the exclusive right of the Śrī. Mutt, the only issue framed and to be decided by the Court.

The petitioner, Mr. Joshier, proved by documents that on the past occasions, the Śrī. Ācāryas had renovated and installed the Tāṭankas. He could not, however prove the exclusive and absolute right of the Śrī. Ācāryas in that regard, as the documents filed in the Court did not mention the same but mentioned Śaṅkarācārya only (in general terms). The Court, therefore, held that the documents did not disclose any such exclusive right though the Śrī. Ācāryas had the right in a general sense. The depositions of some witnesses of the Śrīgerī Mutt were self-contradictory and some against the exhibits filed by Mr. Joshier. The Judge, therefore, did not believe them and dismissed the petition. The Judge further observed that there was no need to examine and decide whether the Kumba. Mutt had the exclusive and absolute right or not since the law says that if one's right - exclusive etc. - was not proved, there was no need for the Court to decide whether or not the other party had the same right.¹

According to Mr. Śarmā, this is the sum and substance in brief of the Tāṭanka Pratiṣṭhā case of 1844. He then goes on to say that even accepting that the Kumba. Mutt finally performed the Tāṭanka Pratiṣṭhā ceremony, it does not establish that the K. Mutt was established by Ādi Śaṅkara, and even if the District Court of Trichy were to say that it was so established, there are judgments of superior Courts like High Courts of Allahabad, Patna, Calcutta and Bombay, Privy Council decisions in the 19th and 20th centuries and Supreme Court Judgments of 1974 and 1979, which state clearly that Ādi Śaṅkara of the 8th cent. A. D. established 4 Āmnāya Mutts only; and as these decisions were based on the specific issues framed in those various cases, they prevailed over those of the District Court Judgement, e. g. Trichy Court Judgement.²

My Comments

(1) Mr. Śarmā has not specified even one of the many past occasions, when the Śrīgerī Ācāryas are said to have renovated the Tāṭankas.

1. Vide *Myth* Ch. 18, pp. 97-100.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 100-101.

As a matter of fact, as this is a tussle between the Śrī. Maṭha and what Mr. Śarmā calls the Kumba. Maṭha, and as the latter is said by him to have come into existence only in the beginning of the 19th cent. A. D. (or after 1790 A. D. at the earliest), there could have been no conflict between the two mutts prior to the present case of 1844 A. D. Mr. Śarmā's statement, however, that the petitioner proved by documents that in the past, the Śrī. Ācārya had renovated the Tāṭaṅkas is not at all true. The Prin. Sadar Amin clearly remarks in his decision in the initial suit by the Śrī. Mutt and the Appellate Court of Trichinopoly agrees with him that "the evidence adduced by the appellant to prove the actual reparation by Śrī. Ācārya in 1757 A. D. and the evidence of the appellants, 1st and 13th witnesses on the point that they were both eye-witnesses to the reparation, is highly improbable and as regards the first witness is utterly false." Mr. Śarmā has said twice¹ that in the past also, Śrī. Ācāryas have renovated the Tāṭaṅkas but he has not produced even a shred of evidence to prove his point nor specified a single occasion when that was done. That the reparation ceremony in 1757 A. D. (about 80 or actually 87 years before 1844 A. D.) could not have been such an occasion has been shown above and as per Mr. Śarmā's stand in the matter of the origin of what he insistently calls the Kumba. Mutt, it is clear that the same Mutt could not have been there to contest the claim of the Śrī. Mutt in 1757 A. D.

There are three books in English, namely, *Transcendental Throne of Wisdom*, *Greatness of Śringerī* and *Śringerī*, the authors of which can almost be called the spokesmen of the Śrī. Maṭha. A similar one in Sanskrit is entitled श्रीशृङ्गेरि श्रीगङ्गुल्लिखितं ग्रन्थः. All these works deal with the Ācāryas of the Śrī. Mutt individually, describing the various deeds of different Ācāryas. None of these works, however, refers even indirectly to so important an event as Tāṭaṅka-Pratiṣṭhā, as having been performed by any Śrī. Ācārya in the past or even to a projected one in 1757 A. D. in particular. The works in English also hardly show any interest in referring to the suit of 1844 A. D., filed by the Śrī. Mutt. Śrī Anantānendra Saraswatī also remarks that Mr. K. R. Venkataraman, who wrote about the Śrī. Ācārya's trip to Rāmeśvaram, has not made any reference to his renovating the Tāṭaṅkas of the Goddess.²

(2) Secondly, neither Mr. Śarmā's reference to rumours and gossips nor to the letter by the new trustees to the Collector requesting him for a new order in place of the old one proves anything about the possible

1. *Ibid.* pp. 98 (top) and 99 (end).

2. Vide *Śrī Saṅ. and Saṅ. Inst.*, by Śrī A. Saras., p. 141 (middle-bracket).

manipulation on the part of Kumba. people. That Mr. Śarmā has to resort to rumours and gossips without any supporting evidence shows the weakness of his case. It is quite possible that there were some people who were interested in the Kumba. Mutt Ācārya for whom they approached the new trustees just as some others were interested in the Śrī. Ācārya, for whom they had approached the old trustees. It is equally possible that the new trustees themselves were interested in the Kumba. Ācārya rather than in the Śrī. Ācārya – and neither can be called an offence – and they approached the Collector in the matter. All this does not warrant any suggestion of any illicit manouvering, which ought to have been proved by Mr. Śarmā by producing evidence but he has not done so. On the other hand, the tendency of the Śrī. Mutt people to try to push forward the claim of the Śrī. Mutt has been noticed in two earlier cases – Śivagaṅgā Mutt and Vīṇpākṣa Mutt – for which purpose they have been principally cited. There was no Tanjore or any other king to help those two mutts then.

(3) Moreover, it has been made to appear by Mr. Śarmā as if Mr. Joshier filed a case in the Court *suo moto* for the Śrī. Mutt while all the other people say that the Śrī. Mutt did so through its (powered – Krishnan) agent and this seems to be the truth in the matter.

(4) Then, if the issue framed in the case was as to whether the Śrī. Mutt had the exclusive and absolute right to repair the Tāṭaṅkas and as two opposite parties were involved in the case, if the right of Śrī. Mutt, one of the two parties, was disproved and negatived, the right of the other party, here the Kumbakonam Ācārya, would be presumed to follow from the rejection of the claim of the Śrī. Mutt, whether or not the Court cares to decide in so many words. The suggestion of Mr. Śarmā in quoting the further observation of the Court about the need of such a decision that the rejection of the right of the Śrī. Mutt does not necessarily imply the acceptance of the same right of the Kumba. Mutt is illogical and invalid. This observation of the Judge shows that the two parties material to the issue were the Śrī. Mutt and the K. Mutt. The further fact that the Kumba. Ācārya actually performed the repairs to the Tāṭaṅkas clinches the issue in favour of the K. Mutt and as tradition has it that it is some Śā. who did the work, it follows by implication that the K. Mutt also was a Śā. institution. Mr. Śarmā fears and is aware of such a possible implication and hence as the last measure, tries to put up against it the decisions of other higher Courts in India to the contrary.

Moreover, if the issue framed by the Court pertained to the exclusive and absolute right, why did the Court say that the Śrī. Mutt had

the right in a general way ? This is clearly outside the issue framed and Mr Śarmā insists on excluding everything strictly outside the issue. That no Śringerī Ācārya had at any time exercised this right has been shown already and whatever Mr. Śarmā may say to the contrary, it is against the available facts.

Then, again, regarding Mr. Śarma's statement that there was before the Court no other issue like the establishment of the K. Mutt by Śaṅ. or the K. Maṭha's lineage being that of Ādi Śaṅkara, Mr. Nīlakanṭha says in so many words that "almost all the arguments now being advanced to denigrate the Kāma. Mutt were then put forward before the Court."¹ Why was this done and why was this allowed by the Court to be done if all other arguments were irrelevant to the issue framed ? And then why does Mr. Śarmā charge the Kumba. Mutt with bringing in all kinds of unconnected issues with a view to propaganda at a future date ? Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī says that the plaintiff, the Śringerī Mutt, had alleged in the plaint that the so-called Śaṅ. of Kāma. Pīṭha was not a Śaṅ. at all and that Śrī Ādi Śaṅkarācārya did not establish the Kāma. Pīṭha² and yet Mr. Śarmā maintains that no such issue was before the Court. Why this statement at all outside the issue framed ?

Lastly, Mr. Śarmā has adduced no evidences to bear out the influence of the Tanjore king in the matter of the Kumba. people getting the new trustees of the temple to approach the Collector for a new order, nor does he say how he learnt that the Collector issued the new order without making any further inquiries in the matter, i. e. for the mere asking by the Kumba. people.

Finally, Mr. Śarmā describes only the first petition of Mr. Joshier and not the subsequent appeals all of which failed. Does he want to attribute all these failures to the influence of the Tanjore king ? If so, it will be a very serious charge against the Courts in question and will need strong supporting evidence, which he has not produced anywhere. Rumours and gossips cannot take the place of such evidence.

Tāṭaṅka Pratiṣṭhā Case of 1908 A. D.

A similar situation arose in 1908 A. D. in connection with Kumbhābhiṣekam at Jambūkeśvaram and the repair and reconsecration of the Tāṭaṅkas, when a similar attempt was made by the Śrī. Swāmiji to perform

1. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. and the Mutts* etc. by Sri K. Nīla., p. 3.

2. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Inst.* by Śrī A. Saraswati, p. 141 (last 5/6 lines).

the reconsecration ceremony. A great commotion took place and ultimately, the Kumba. Swāmi performed the ceremony, very much to the disappointment and chagrin of the Śrī. Mutt Ācārya and his Mutt peoples. After the ceremony was over, the Tahasildār and Tq. second class magistrate of Trichinopoly sent on 8-3-1908 a detailed report of what happened during the period, to the Headquarters Revenue Divisional officer and sub-divisional Magistrate, Trichinopoly.¹ The report is extremely revealing as well as damaging to the image of the Śrīgerī Swāmiji on account of the intrigues and manipulations by the Śrī. Mutt people on behalf of the Swāmiji to set aside the young (and then minor) Kumba. Ācārya, Śrī Candrasekhara Saraswati so that the Śrī. Ācārya should get the chance to perform the reconsecration ceremony. The Tahasildār has remarked at least at two places that "it somehow became the object of the Śrīgerī Mutt to cover the jurisdiction of the Kumba. Guru,"² and that "the Śrī. Swāmi is gradually encroaching upon the spiritual jurisdiction of the other Hindu religious heads in British Dominions..."³

Thus, this attempt was made thrice in all by the Śrī. Mutt against the same Kumba. Mutt — in 1757 A. D., 1844 A. D. and 1903 A. D. — every-time in respect of the Tāṭaka Pratiṣṭhā of the Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī at Jambūkeśvaram — by a Mutt that is claimed by its adherents as the first, foremost and most highly respected of the Mutts established by Āli Śaṅ. And yet, Mr. Śarmā writes about the black deeds (काळे कर्तूत) of the Kumba. Mutt people, of which (deeds), he says, they are not ashamed. As said already, they tried it with the Virūpākṣa and Śivagaṅgā Mutts but their real target was the Kumba. Mutt. The 1757 A. D. case has been dealt with already, wherein the claim of the Śrī. Mutt was dismissed with costs by the Court as unproved in the 1844 A. D. suit and therewith the 1844 suit also, along with the claim of the Śrī. Mutt which was dismissed by the Courts 4 times in all — in the main suit and in the appeals preferred against the decision of the Court in the main suit. A few salient points, as made out in the Tahasildār's report, deserve to be noticed, in order to understand and also assess Mr. Śarmā's statement (of sum and substance) of the 1844 — suit and also the remarks of the Tahasildār in respect of the 1908 suit in particular.

-
1. Vide No. R. C. 4686 of 07, Sub. dated 8.3.1908, P. Dis. 516/08 of 31.12.1908. The name of the Tahasildar is : M. R. Ry., P. K. Rajam Iyer Avergal, M. B. S. A. (London).
 2. The Tahasildār's Report, p. 13, para No. 12.
 3. *Ibid.*, p. 23, para. No. 42.

In the year 1844, the temple authorities and the then leading men of Jambūkeśvaram invited, as on previous occasions, the then predecessor of the present Kumba. Swāmī to have the Tāṭaṅkas of the Akhilāṇḍeśvari Devī repaired and this was accordingly executed with the necessary purification ceremony performed by the Kumb. Swāmī.

Thereupon, with the connivance of some local people, the then head of the Śrī. Mutt, after an unsuccessful attempt to enlist the sympathies of the executive authorities in his favour, instituted a suit in O. S. No. 96/1844 on the file of Prin. Sadar Amin Court at Trichinopoly, alleging *inter alia* that the heads of the Śrī. Mutt represented the true line of successors to the great Śān. Swamy, that they were entitled to perform, and had performed in the past, duties of consecrating the idol of Akhilāṇḍeśvari. Devī and that the then heads of the Kumba. Mutt had usurped these rights and therefore prayed that the rights and titles of the Śrī. Mutt may be declared and the Kumba. Swāmī be restrained from interfering. (Mr. Śarmā's 'sum and substance' of this case may be compared with this.)¹

The suit was dismissed with costs by the Prin. Sadar Amin, who found that the principal documents produced in support of the rights, viz. previous exercise thereof by the Śrī. Mutt, were not genuine and that the then plaintiff's evidence was concocted and unreliable.

In the suit itself, the plaintiff's i. e. Śrī. Mutt's allegation that he and his predecessors alone had exercised spiritual jurisdiction over Trichinopoly and other districts ... was refuted, the then Kumba. Swamy (the second defendant in the suit) had filed a document of agreement dated 18 of the 2nd fortnight of Aśvin of the year 1790 (or 1690?) Śālivāhana Era, in which the Śrī. Guru had acknowledged the claims of the then head of the Kumba. Mutt to be the successor of the great Śān. Swāmī, with his rights to exclusive jurisdiction over all tracts of countries inclusive of the Trichinopoly district. This much about the 1844 A. D. case.

Now regarding the 1908 A. D. suit, which also pertained to the (same) Tāṭaṅka-Pratiṣṭhā the following points may be noted :

(1) On the occasions, the Śrī. Swāmī paid two visits to Trichinopoly (i. e. those parts) and on both these occasions, he was not allowed to enter the temple, having no claim to any such rights (i. e. to repair the Tāṭaṅkas). On one of the two occasions, the Sthaladara simply blocked the doorway and ... in spite of all skilful efforts to usurp certain rights, the Śrī. Guru

1. *Ibid.*, p. 15, para. No. 17.

gained nothing more than mere admission to the premises of the Swamy and Amman Temple, just like any other person of a holy Mathādhīpati.¹

(2) Regarding the Tāṭaṅka Pratiṣṭhā in 1908, the first thing we find is that a split was brought about among the *arcakas* and servants by the influence of the rich trustees, of whom Mr. Chidambaram Chetty seems to have been left in charge of all management. When he was (casually) asked about the two Svāmīs of Śṛṅgerī and Kumba Mutt, he assured the questioner that he had just sent invitations to both the Gurus ... and when someone said that no invitation was sent to the Kumba. Svāmī, he assured him that it was sent by him long ago, alongwith the one to the Śṛṅgerī Svāmī.²

As a matter of fact, however, the invitation to the Kumba. Svāmī did not go till about a week before the commencement of the ceremonies. This delay was ultimately admitted and was alleged to be due to the trustee's agent at Kumba. delivering the invitation letter (*patrikā*) on his return.³

(3) When the Tahasildar had some misgivings about the whole matter and when he approached the Arcakas, the latter told him that there was a split among the Arcakas. Some of them told him that the trustees had divided those that would support their design from the rest (who would not) and when their attention was drawn to the decision in the previous suit, they said that they were trustee's subordinates... All this took place about the end of January 1908, when it was too late for regular enquiry.

"It appears," the Tahasildar states, "in the state of things, a civil suit or plaint drawn by no less a person than Mr. Śivaswāmy Iyer C. I. E., the Advocate General, for an injunction to restrain the Śṛṅgerī Svāmī, from interfering with the established rights was not actually instituted. The value of Rs. 125/- of the plaint was refunded on application.

The trustee had obviously an interest in the Śṛ. Svāmī, who, he said, should not be disappointed in his attempt to celebrate the Kumbhā-bhiṣekam. Even though he had no desire to meddle with the Tāṭaṅka-Pratiṣṭhā against the terms of the civil decree, he wanted to know what right the Kumba. Svāmī had as a result on account of the decree. Even his having done so earlier was immaterial (his words are: 'So what of

1. *Ibid.*, p. 15, para. No. 18.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 16, para. No. 21.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 16, para. No. 22.

that'?) He even questioned the appointment of the new Kumba. Swāmi, then only a minor (Śrī Candra. Saras. was about 15 years old then) and not installed by any one to the office as Guru etc.¹

The Kumba. Swāmi, who was then away at Rāmeśvaram, came to know about the attempts made by the Śrī. Mutt for its Ācārya to perform the repairs to the Tāṭaṅkas of the Goddess, rushed back to Kumba., where he arrived on 1-2-1908. The Śrī. Swamiji, with the help of the Chettiers and the trustee, tried to enter the temple at night without any previous intimation to the police authorities. On 6-2-1908, at about 9-30 a. m., a trusted person of the trustee, viz. Mr. Cidambaram Chettiar, came running to the Tahasildar to inform him that the Kumba. Swamy, who was in, before the Amman before the Sanctum Sanctorum, was doing something objectionable by way of Mantras in the water kept before him, that he was doing the Abhi-ṣeka for the Amman before doing it for the Kalaśam and that the Chettiar asked him to go and stop the Swāmi as it was revolting to him. When, however, these people actually went to the Amman, the Swāmi was seen sitting in a corner, away from the Amman and doing nothing. In spite of this, the Chettiar tried to assert that his information was correct and that the Swāmi had since stopped doing what he was (actually) doing. But all the Kalaśas were found intact and undischarged (i. e. unused). At this stage, the trustee disappeared and then the ceremonies proceeded and at long last got over without any (further) difficulty.

"When all was over for the day, it came out in the evening that the trustee's men as pre-arranged, gave out the news (that was) concocted, to enable the trustee to get the (Kumba.) Swamy out, by way of insult and finding justification to call in the aged (Śrī.) Swāmi, ripe in experience, to consecrate the idol to his satisfaction and to establish his right so eagerly sought for a long time in many ways. The plan ended in disappointment (to the Swamiji of Śrīgerī) as the Inspector, myself (i. e. Tabasildar) and all the Sthaladars were not to allow the joining of hands to outburst."

Next came the actual ceremony of placing the Tāṭaṅkas. The Kumba. Swamy was inside the temple for the purpose but the bringing in of the Tāṭaṅkas was being delayed purposely to irk the (Kumba.) Swāmi, and thereby to make him leave the room so that the Śrīgerī Swāmi could enter there at 12 noon as planned earlier, and put the Tāṭaṅkas on the

1. For the three paragraphs under (3) above, vide *ibid.*, p. 16, para. No. 22 and p. 17, para. Nos. 24-25.

image. The Kumba. Swāmi, however, hardly cared for the delay and did not go away till the adornment ceremony was performed. And finally, when all the plans of the trustee Chettiars failed, the Kumba. Swāmi had to be allowed to do the ceremony. By 3 p. m., the Swāmi himself was able to leave the temple.¹

The Śrīṅgerī Swāmi left for Śrīraṅgam on 8-2-1908 but attempts were made by the Chettiars once again to arrange for his procession in the street of the Mutt but when he was informed of the custom that no other head-priest (other than Kumba. Swāmi) could pass the Kumb. Śān. Mutt in this street, the idea had to be given up.²

All this makes a very disgusting reading and yet I have given it at some length, certainly not in full, just to show how the matters stood in 1908 (according to the official version) because it throws light upon what happened then and what must have happened in similar cases in 1757 A. D. and 1844 A. D., as also to clear up certain issues pertaining to the two mutts — Śrīṅgerī and Kāñci or Kumba. — their comparative rights and status. In my humble opinion, it also lays bare the falsehoods in Mr. Śarmā's "sum and substance" of the 1844 suit. Further comment seems unnecessary. I only quote one remark of Mr. Krishnan, bearing on this topic. "In the report forwarded later by the officer in charge of the Kumbhābhisekam to the Govt. on the conduct of the consecration, the officer has made (passed) some strictures on the authorities of the Śrī. Mutt, particularly on their attempts to establish their undue claims."³

Apart from the actual Court cases, there have been many other incidents, in which too the interests of the Śrī. and K. Mutts have clashed with each other and wherein, the Śrī. Mutt has tried to assert its superiority to the other mutts, particularly the K. Mutt, even denying the establishment of such a mutt by Śān. and trying to show that it is only a branch of the Śān. Mutt and hence subordinate to it. The attempts of the Śrī. Mutt in 1837 A. D. and 1838 A. D. in Kumba. and Trichinopoly and how they failed have been discussed already. The following are a few more given by Sri Anantā. Saras., Nīla. and others.

In 1868 (Mr. Krishnan has mentioned this year wrongly as 1878 A. D.), the Śrī. Swāmi tried again to go in procession along the Mutt street in

1. For the three preceding paras above, *ibid.*, pp. 19-20, para. Nos. 33-36.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 22, para. No. 39.

3. Vide *The Śrī. Māṭha* Mr. B. Krishnan, p. 40 last para. and *Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and the Mutts established by him* etc. by Sri K. Nilakanthan, p. 5 (c).

Kumba. but his attention was drawn to the order previously passed in 1837 A. D. and the Tahasildar was directed to see that the order was enforced.¹

In 1853 A. D., on the occasion of taking in a procession, with full temple-honours, of a customary Śrīmukham by the Kāma. Mutt through the Sannidhi Street in Madurai to the Minākṣi temple, one Rāma Pandit objected on behalf of the Śrī. Mutt to the procession. On enquiry, it was found that the building in the Sannidhi Street was not a mutt at all but a building belonging to the Śrī. Mutt (even this was doubted later on) where "a so called agent was living with his fami'y." Finally, the right of the Kumba. Mutt to take out the Śrīmukham in procession was recognised by the Foujadari court and confirmed by the Governor-in-Council.²

In 1870, the Śrīngerī Ācārya sent a Śrīmukham to the citizens of Madras, announcing his intention of visiting Madras. Thereupon, the Sabhāpati of Madras Assembly sent a reply saying that the people of Madras would receive the Śrīngerī Ācārya, only if he did not collect अप्रसंगिकता etc. from the residents of the places he visited as they were under the jurisdiction of the Kāma. Mutt. The Śrīngerī Ācārya assured them that there was no intention of doing anything against the interests of the Kāma. Pīṭha (कामकोटि पीठनकी) — both these words were used by the Śrī. Ācārya himself, showing thereby that the Śrī. Mutt recognised the Kāma. Pīṭha as such.³

In 1871-72, a new stanza was added to the Śrīngerī almanac as under: कृदलिकुम्भकोणादिमठाधितयश्च ये । शृङ्गेरीगुरुशिष्या इत्यादियन्ते क्वचिद्बुधैः ॥ The stanza means that the Kūḍali and Kumba. Ācāryas are the disciples of the Śrīngerī Guru. This matter was investigated. To consider the correctness of the stanza, the same was referred to one person named Sri Gurram Venkatarām Śāstry of Nellore by the Sabhā of the Āstikas of Madras at one of their periodical meetings, generally held in the premises of the Kāma. Mutt. Mr. Śāstry collected "literary and documentary materials" by way of evidence, but actually based his own conclusion on the Śrīmukhas and seals of most of the Advaita Mutts he collected for the purpose. His general conclusion was that "the epithets and seals of all the mutts except those of the Kāma. Pīṭha pertained to Śrī Vidyāranya of Vijayanagar while the epithets and seals of the Kāma. Pīṭha pertained to Śrī Ādi Śaṅkarācārya". This finding, then embodied in a book called *Śrīmukha-Vyākhyā*, was subsequently confirmed by one Vedānta Rāmānuja Iyengar, an aged

1. Vide *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Inst.* by Sri A. Saras., 143; *Śrī Śaṅ. and Matt etc.* by Sri K. Nilakanthan, p. 3.

2. Sri A. Saras., *op. cit.*, pp. 142-43; Sri K. Nila., *op. cit.*, p. 3.

3. Sri A. Saras., *op. cit.*, pp. 143-44; Sri K. Nila., *op. cit.*, p. 4.

Vaiṣṇava head, selected to act as a mediator in the matter. His decision was embodied in a book (in Telugu) called *Śrī mukha-Vyākhyā-Siddhānta Patrikā*.¹

Mr. Mudigoṇḍa V. Śāstry and Mr. R. G. Śarmā* have represented this case considerably differently and raised a number of objections to its

1. For a statement of this case, vide Sri A. Saras. pp.144-45 and Śrī. K. Nila., pp. 4-5.
2. Mr. R. G. Śarmā in his book *K. K. Mutt : A Myth* (1987 A.D.) has finished this case-account in a single sentence as follows. "In 1872, Vidwan Gurram Venkanna Śāstry, who was a Kāñci Mutt protege, translated श्रीमुखव्याख्या into Telugu and published it under the title सिद्धान्तपत्रिका and put the author's name as Vedānta Rāmānuja Iyengar" (p.21). He has omitted all the other details pertaining to the case.

In his earlier work *JSMV* (1962), he has made out a few more points as follows :

(1) The Birudāvali of the Kumba. Mutt was known as श्रीमुख in South India and it was being used by that Mutt to establish that Śaṅ. had established the same. This श्रीमुख was written by Vidwan G. V. Śāstry himself and neither by Ādi Śaṅ. nor by any of his 4 principal discip'les. The Birudāvali etc. contained therein also did not belong to Śaṅ.'s times nor to any proximate time.

(2) The Kumba. Mutt started vicious propaganda against the Śaṅ. Mutt and then, taking advantage of the indifference of the Śrīṅgeri Ācārya and his followers, intensified the same. To counter all this activity, Vedamūṛty Subramanya Siddhānti had to insert the disputed stanza in the Pīṭhika (Preamble) of the प्रजोत्पत्तिपञ्चाङ्ग of the Śrīṅgeri Mutt to bring to light the truth that the Kumba. Mutt was a branch mutt only. On the contrary, the Kumba. Mutt said in Kāśī in 1935 A.D. that works like श्रीमुखदर्पण, श्रीमुखव्याख्या and सिद्धान्तपत्रिका were the result of the false propaganda of the Śrī. Mutt followers against the Kumba. Mutt (For all this account, vide *JSMV*, pp. 281-290.

Two points deserve to be considered here :

(i) If all the action was due to the vicious propaganda, which it was intended to counteract, why were the Kuḍali and other mutts (कुडली-कुम्भकोण-आदि) also included in the list of subordinate or branch mutts of the Śrīṅgeri Mutt ?

(ii) In view of the Court-cases and the various other pieces of evidence cited in the earlier pages, can any one maintain or support the stand attributed by Mr. Śarmā to the Śrī. people, unless all these incidents are absolutely fake and unreliable ?

Mr. M. V. Śāstry's contention is : (*Kāmakoti-Śatakoti*, pp. v-vi) :

- (i) Śrī Rāmā. Iyengar denied having written the सिद्धान्तपत्रिका;
- (ii) परमहंस आचार्य means a शङ्कर-सम्प्रदाय-संन्यासी. Mr. Iyengar is a विशिष्टादेती, a Vaiṣṇavite. No real Vaiṣṇavite will accept such a title;

(Continued on the next page)

findings. Neither of them, however, denies the insertion of the stanza itself. And, then, independently of any arguments or criticisms by others, it is very clear and quite easy to see that the stanza, as it is, tries to reduce the Ācāryas of both Kūḍali and Kumba. Mutts to a position only subordinate to that of the Śrī. Guru, of whom they are said to be disciples, and this is all the point at issue here. Mr. Śāstry remarks that without understanding the meaning of the word इति in the new stanza, the Kumba. Mutt, presuming that Kumba. Mutt heads are said to be the disciples of Śrī. Jagadguru, began to say that the Śrī. Gurus are the disciples of Puṣpa-Pīṭha, which is the Śiṣya Pīṭha of Kumba.¹ The writer does not mention the names of Kumba. Mutt persons who say so, nor does he give the correct meaning of the word इति in the stanza. Even if, however, someone has actually said so, it need not be accepted as correct and yet the meaning of the stanza as it stands is transparently clear that the Kumba. Ācārya (as also the Kūḍali Ācārya) is sought to be made therein a disciple of and thereby subordinate to the Śrīgeri Guru. Any other interpretation of the stanza, given by anyone, can be rejected as being contrary to the import of the stanza. The attempt of the Śrī. Mutt to represent the Kumba. Mutt as a branch thereof seems to be unmistakably clear.

In 1885 Kāma. Swāmi visited the Vizianagaram Saṁsthānam. One Mr. Vāvilla Rāmaswāmi Śāstri, an adherent of the Śrī. Mutt, wrote a letter to Vizianagaram saying that the Kāma. Pīṭha was not established by Ādi Śaṅkara and hence the Kāma. Ācārya should not be shown honour due to a Śaṅkarācārya but be respected as an ordinary Sannyāsin only. They also sent him a copy of a book शाङ्करमठतत्त्वप्रकाशिकार्थसंग्रह by one Kokkandam Venkataraman Pantalu, which criticised the सिद्धान्तपत्रिका referred to above. The Pandits of the Saṁsthānam, however, refuted the book of Mr.

(Continued from last page)

(iii) One Mr. K. V. Pantalu criticised the सिद्धान्तपत्रिका as a mass of nonsense and foolish, cooked-up fantasy.

Firstly, Mr. Rāmā. Iyengar was approached as a mediator and purposely because he was a Vaiṣṇavite, not likely to be biased either way. He is only said to have endorsed the decision in the श्रीमुख्याख्या and when it was translated into Telugu, the सिद्धान्तपत्रिका may have been attributed to him because it carried his confirmation, which was certainly not extracted by coercion or under pressure.

Neither Śrī Anantānendra Saraswati nor Śrī K. Nilakanthan refers to Mr. Rāmānuja Iyengar as a परमार्थ आचार्य.

The third objection is being dealt with just a little later.

1. Vide Kāmakoti-Śaṅkoti by Śrī M. V. Śāstry, p. 9.

Pantalu's and confirmed the सिद्धान्तपत्रिका. Thereafter, a reply to Mr. Pantalu's book was also given in a book called शांकरमठसुबोधिनी by one Śrī Gadhā Jagannatha Pākayāji of Ellore, at the instance of the Mahājana Sabhā of Madras.¹ All this serves to show how the Śrīngerī Mutt was working against the K. K. Mutt. In 1884 A. D. also, one Nārayaṇa Śāstri of Naḍu Kāveri in Tanjore Dt., an adherent of the Śrīngerī Mutt, wrote a small book आचार्यचरितविमर्शिन,² in Part II of which he says that the Kāma. Pīṭha was not established by Śrī Ādi Śaṅkarācārya.

Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī tells us from a reliable source that in 1973 A. D., Śrī Jayendra Saras. of Kāma. Mutt was on a tour to Badari. and was to camp for about a week at the Sapta R̥ṣi Āśrama. At that time, Mr. Rāja Gopāla Śarmā approached the authorities of the Āśrama and asked them not to allow the Kāma. Ācārya to camp there as the Kāma. Pīṭha was not established by Ādi. Śaṅ. The authorities, however, told him that the Kāma. Mutt alone was doing some good work while the other Mutts were quarrelling among themselves and were before some Court or the other.³

In 1942 A. D., during the reign of Śrī Chandra Bhāratī (1912-1954), one Viśuddhānanda Bhāratī residing in a building belonging to the Śrīngerī Mutt at Kāñcīpuram, wrote to the Śrī. Mutt that the building be allowed to be converted into a Mutt and that Pādukas be kept there and worshipped. The reply thereto, dt. 14. 10. 1942, however, stated that the building there should not be considered a Mutt and that "it has not been the intention of the (Śrī.) Mutt to give it any better status, especially because it is the seat of the Kāma. Pīṭha and it is not advisable to get ourselves into any controversy with the great Mutt or to create any rivalry in that locality."⁴

Finally after Śrī Abhi. Vidyā. Tīrtha became the head (i. e. Ācārya) of the Śrīngerī Mutt, one book on Śrī Ādi Śaṅkara by one Śuddhānanda Bhāratī of Pondicherry was taken to the Mutt for getting a Śrīmukham. The book contained some references to the Kāma. Mutt. The Śrīngerī Ācārya told the author that the Śrīmukham would be given only if all the references to the K. Mutt were removed. The Śrīmukham was given only after such

1. Vide (i) Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti. by Śrī A. Saras. p. 146.

and (ii) Śrī Śaṅ. and the Mutts etc. by Śrī K. Nilā., p. 5.

2. Published in 1960 under the caption Ācārya-carita by Vāṇī Vilāsa Press, Śrīraṅgam.

3. Vide Śrī A. Sarasvatī, op. cit., p. 137 (top).

4. Ibid., pp. 151-52 and Mr. Nilakanthan, op. cit., p. 9.

references were removed. The hostility to the K. Mutt on the part of the Śringerī Mutt is unmistakable.¹

Concluding Comments :

All the cases and their accounts, as given by Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī, Sri Nilakaṇṭhan (and Mr. Krishnan) as also the Tahasiladar's report to the Govt. and also the incidents described above after the Court-cases reveal very clearly that instead of the Kumba, or Kāñci Mutt it is the (Tuṅgā) Śringerī Mutt that is found incessantly planning and trying to claim unjustifiably and usurp the rights and privileges of the Kumba. Mutt in particular as also of other Mutts like Kūḍali, Śivagaṅgā and so on, and at the same time trying to charge the Kumba. Mutt with doing so.² It also tries to show, now and then, that the Kūḍali and Kāma, or Kumba. Mutts are not established by Ādi Śaṅkarācārya at all; they are of a recent origin or at best just the branches of the (T.) Śrī. Mutt, the premier Mutt established by Śaṅ. We have seen that the Śringerī Mutt has failed to vindicate its position even on a single occasion. Mr. Śarmā is fond of saying that the Kumba. Mutt, by which name he insists on referring to the Kāñci or Kāma. Mutt, has by its propaganda tried to boost up its own claims and succeeded in doing so with the indulgent attention and influence of the Tanjore king. But how the Tanjore king's influence could work in the case of mutts like Kūḍali, Śivagaṅgā or Virūpākṣa and even in the case of the Kumba. Mutt in the matter of Madras and Madura people, who do not belong to the jurisdiction of the Tanjore king, is not understood. The Śringerī Mutt lost its case against Kūḍali Mutt in the Mysore Court which confirmed the decision of the appellate Court. In fact, even though Mr. Śarmā has written his book *Kāñci Kāma. Mutt - A Myth* in 1987 A. D., i. e. 9 years after Mr. Nilakaṇṭhan's book (1978 A. D.) and 5 years after that of Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī (1982 A. D.), he has not only not answered the arguments of the either but has also not cared to take their notice, nor again has he tried in the least to retrieve the ground lost by the Śringerī Mutt.

If, as Mr. Śarmā and others of his view say, there was no such thing as a Kāñci Kāma. Mutt at all and what is made to pass as such is nothing but the Kumba. Mutt, started under the aegis of the Tanjore king in 1821 or in 1791 at the earliest, how do they explain the Śrī. Mutt's losing the case against that same mutt in 1757 A. D. ? Does this not show that the 'so called' Kumba. Mutt must have been in existence long before 1757

1. Śrī A. Sarasvatī, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

2. *Myth*, p. 99, para. 1.

A. D., to have been able to score such a victory over such a formidable rival and a prestigious institution as the Śrīngerī Mutt ?

In the Tāṭaṅka Pratiṣṭhā case in 1844 A. D., the Śrī. Mutt lost the case at 4 stages or levels. Was this also due to the influence of Tanjore king? Were the Prin. Sadar Amin and the three subsequent courts also swayed by the influence of that king? A very strong and convincing evidence required to prove this point has, however, not been brought forward by any one, at least uptill now.

Then, again, the attempt of the Śrīngerī Mutt in 1837 A. D. to go in procession through the Mutt street in Kumba. was objected to by the local people on the ground of an age-old custom that Kāñci Kāma. Mutt alone was allowed to do so. If this is true how is a custom age-old in 1837 A. D. consistent with the contention of the opponents of K. Mutt that the so-called Kumba. Mutt was a very recent affair, having come into existence in 1821 or 1791 A. D. at the earliest? The Śrīngerī Ācārya had to give up the attempt, which was, however, repeated in 1858 A. D., only to meet with the same fate.

The failure of the Śrī. Ācārya still earlier in 1829 A. D. and later in 1853 and 1870 A. D., as seen already, bears out the same point, viz. that the Kumba i. e. Kāñci Mutt had become so firmly rooted in the society and in the minds of the people that the Śrī. Ācārya and his followers could not succeed against it even once. And to repeat, Mr. Sarmā, or any one else for that matter, has not put in a word, sentence or argument to establish again the position or status of the Śrīngerī Ācārya.

Śrī Anantānendra Sarasvatī furnishes a strange piece of evidence. After describing the establishment of the Avani Mutt about 500 or 600 years ago, he tells us that in the 18th cent. A. D., the Ācārya of that Mutt went on a tour of the Southern districts of the Madras State (then called Presidency). While travelling in the Trichy Dist., the Mutt collected अग्रसेभावना etc. from the residents of the villages on the bank of Akhaṇḍa-Kāverī. When it was pointed out to the Maṭha that it was not proper to do so (as the Trichy Dt. was under the jurisdiction of the Kumba. Mutt), the Maṭha returned the collected अग्र. to the Kāma. Pīṭha and also assured the latter in writing that in the course of their pilgrimage to Rāmeśvaram, Rāmnād, Śiva and other places it would not collect अग्र. there and would return to its place after finishing the pilgrimage to Rāmeśvaram, Tirunelveli and Anantaśayanam.¹

1. Śrī A. Sarasvatī, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-110,

In the first place, this shows that the Kumba. Mutt was well-established in the 18th cent. A. D. and was mentioned as Kāma. Pīṭha. Secondly, when the Avani Mutt was itself an off-shoot of the Śrī. Mutt and if there were no such Mutt as even a Kumba. Mutt before 1791 A. D., how was the objection raised by that Mutt which did not exist? Why was the objection to the collection of अग्र० sustained by the Avani Mutt and why and how was the collected अग्र० returned to the Kumba. Pīṭha and not to the Śrīgeri Mutt? Thirdly, why all the solicitousness on the part of the Avani Mutt to go out of its way to write a letter to the Kāma. Pīṭha and assure it that no further अग्र० would be collected at the places mentioned in the letter by the Avani Mutt — not to say about its assurance to return to its place after the pilgrimage. Is all this account of the whole incident concocted or was the Tanjore king used here also? Any alternative, if proposed, will have to be supported by evidence and failing it, the implication is quite clear.

The Copper Plate Grants

I have discussed these at some length in my thesis but in view of a lot of new criticism by Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkataraman, it is necessary to say something about their points of criticism.

According to Mr. K. Sunderamiah, "the attempt of the Mutt to print only 10 grants out of 125, some of which are fragments and consist of one or two plates" is only to palm them off as proof of their new claim. An impartial study of the same would only prove the contrary. The general view of the opponents of the Kāñci Mutt is that these grants cannot be relied upon as genuine ones and do not prove the genuineness of the Kāñci Mutt as having been established by Śaṅ. At the most, they point to a branch of the Śrī. Mutt in Kāñci, since the plates mention the name of the Mutt as a Śārada Mutt, which points to the Śrī. Mutt only, the Kumba. Ācārya being called a चिक्कुडयारस्वामी (Junior Swami) implying a दोड्डयार स्वामी (Senior Swami) which is the Śrī. Mutt only. In fact, Mr. Sunderamiah maintains that the reason for the wanton destruction of the remaining 115 grants is this new claim of the Kumba. Mutt and that the alleged possession of the grants with the Kumba. Mutt should have been only as trustees or agents of the Śrī. Mutt. (vide his *Sri Śrīgeri Śārada Mutt*, p. 19).

I wish to discuss here not all but only a few points of Mr. Śarmā's and Mr. Venkataraman's criticism.

Grant No. 1

This is almost the most important of the 10 grants and the critics have devoted their maximum attention to it. Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkataraman have raised the following objections against the grant.

(i) The grantee's name is given in the grant as शंकरार्ययोगी or शंकरगुरु. This word cannot mean शंकराचार्य. Mr. H. K. Śāstry of the Archaeological Dept. does not say that the donee शंकरार्य was शंकराचार्य, nor does he say that the Mutt to the west of the temple हस्तिशैलनाथ was a Śaṅkara Maṭha. According to him "this explanation that शंकरार्य is शंकराचार्य is farfetched. 'To the holy Guru शंकरार्य' would be the plain interpretation of the phrase श्रीशंकरार्यगुरुवे." In G. O. No. 1260, dt. 25-8-1915, it is mentioned that "it is not clearly stated in the record if the Mutt presided over by शंकरार्य was identical with the Śaṅkarācārya Maṭha at Conjeevaram."¹ The शंकराचार्य, to whom the grant has been given is not mentioned by names and "it is inconceivable that the grantor would not have known the name of the Śaṅ., who was a सार्वभौम जगद्गुरु."² शंकरार्य and शंकराचार्य are two different names and each might be even a different Āśrama.

(ii) The word द्विजन्मने (Śarmā) / द्विजन्मना (Venkaṭa) in particular and the word पोषिलि prove (beyond doubt) that they refer to a householder (गृहस्थ) only because no Sannyāsin (like Śaṅ.) who has burnt all his boats and left home and name can be described as a द्विजन्मा (an आश्रमी or वर्णी) or by his family-name or house-name (*inti peru*). The house-name shows that he was a householder.³

Mr. Śarmā argues that the qualifications and adjectives नित्यान्नदान etc. do not establish that the plate refers to the Kāñcī Mutt only. Except the last two phrases (द्विजन्मने and पोषिलि प्रथितात्मने), which can apply to a householder only, the remaining phrases can be used for a householder and also for a Yati i. e. Sannyāsin.⁴

(a) Now, as regards the word शंकरार्य, we find that both the *Mādhaviya* and the *G. V. K.* use this word to denote शंकराचार्य 4 times each. Similarly, the word शंकरगुरु has also been used by the *Mādhaviya* to denote शंकराचार्य as many as 4 times. Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita's *Śaṅkarābhyudaya*

1. *Myth*, pp. 60-61; *JSMV*, pp. 433, 437, 442.

2. *Myth*, p. 65; *JSMV*, p. 442.

3. *Truth*, p. 214; *Myth*, pp. 61, 65, 67, 68; *JSMV*, pp. 437, 441.

4. *Myth*, p. 65; *JSMV*, p. 437; *Truth*, p. 214.

and Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's *Paṭaṅjalīcarita* also use the word शंकरार्य to denote शंकर(चार्य).¹

It may be noted in passing that the *Mādhaviya* uses the expression मण्डनार्य for मण्डन (VIII: 52) and the *G. V. K.* uses the expressions सुरेश्वरार्य (II: 59) and पञ्चपादाचार्ययोगी (III: 60) to denote सुरेश्वराचार्य and पञ्चपादाचार्य respectively.

(b) Regarding the word द्विजन्मना or द्विजन्मने, the first thing to be noted is that the word found in the grant is द्विजन्मने and not द्विजन्मना. The word in the grant, however, does not appear as an independent word qualifying the word शंकरगुरुवे as taken by Mr. Śarmā but as the last member of a Bahuvrīhi compound नित्यान्नदान ... सन्तर्पितद्विजात्मने, which qualifies the word शंकरार्यगुरुवे. The compound word is then explained as नित्यान्नदान ... सन्तर्पिताः द्विजन्मानः येन सः शंकरगुरुः, तस्मै — to शंकरगुरु, who has pleased the brahmins etc. This is the meaning given by Mr. T. A. G. Rao and that is also the correct interpretation of the text of the grant. Mr. Śarmā brings in the word द्विजन्मने twice and that also as a separate word, so as to qualify the word शं.गुरुवे, once after शिवध्यानरतात्मने and then in the compound नित्यान्नदान ... द्विजात्मने.² There is no warrant for the first द्विजात्मने after शिव. ध्यानरतात्मने nor for its separate use in the second case. It occurs at the second place only and that also at the end of the Bahuvrīhi compound. It seems that Mr. Śarmā has added the word after the word शिवध्यानरतात्मने so that it can be taken separately and then be interpreted the way he wants to interpret it. Mr. Śarmā's pitiable (or is it only feigned?) ignorance of ordinary Sanskrit thus becomes evident, and also brings to light the futility of his deliberate attempt to twist the text of the grant by taking the word द्विजन्मने twice and separating it from the compound in the second case.

(c) Regarding the words पोप्पिल्लि प्रथितात्मने, Mr. Rameśan tells us that Śaṅ. is still referred to the Kaipilli Illam as his birth place.³ Neither

1. (a) For the word शङ्करार्य, denoting शङ्कराचार्य, vide :

(1) *S. Ś. Jaya* of Mādhava or *Mādhavīya*, V. 101, VI. 86, 87, IX. 42;

(2) *G. V. K.*, II. 35; III. 31, 51, 59; (2a) *S. M. S.*, V. 24, 69; VI. 75;

(3) *शङ्कराभ्युदय* of Rāja. D., I. : 1, 65, II. : 9.

(4) *Pat. Ca.*, VIII. : 71;

(5) श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्याष्टोत्तरशतनामस्तोत्रम् St. 24 (Pub. by Vāṇi Vilāsa Press, Śrīraṅgam), under श्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पादानां अष्टोत्तरशतनामस्तोत्रं नामावलिश्च ।

(b) For the word शङ्करगुरु, used for शङ्कराचार्य, vide : *S. Ś. Jaya* of Mādhava or *Mādhavīya*, IV. : 75, 76; V. : 31; VI. : 11, 94; X. : 95.

2. Vide *Myth*, p. 65 and p. 63 resp.

3. Vide *Śrī Kāñcī Kāma. Pīṭham through the ages* by Sri N. Rameśan, pp. 17-18.

Mr. Rameśan nor Mr. Rao has given any definite meaning for the word पोषिहि, but mentioning the house-name, or as it appears to be more probable, the village-name does not make a person a householder nor is it against his being a Sannyāsin. Even after Śaṅ. had burnt all his boats etc., he is still described as being born at Kālaḍy and being the son of Śivaguru and Āryāmbā. In fact, the work *Anantānendragiriya* is regarded as unreliable because Jivānanda Vidyāsagar's edition of the same is said to give wrong particulars about Śaṅ.'s parents and his birth-place.

The two words द्विजन्मने and पोषिहि, therefore, do not clinch the issue and do not prove anything objectionable for the view that शंकरार्थगुरु was a Sannyāsin. Mr. Śarmā's argument, therefore, that the word शं.गुरु may mean either a householder or a Sannyāsin (yati) but for these two words becomes meaningless. The two words do not point to a householder. And since the words शंकरार्थगुरु and शंकरगुरु are both found to be used to denote Śaṅ., in *Mādhaviya* and *G. V. K.*—both approved and sponsored by the Śrīgeri Mutt—it becomes clear that they do not mean a householder and hence mean a Yati or a Sannyāsin only.

This Grant I refers to a पश्चिममठ in Kāñcl and शंकरार्थगुरु is said to be connected with it. शंकरार्थगुरु has been shown to be a reference to Śaṅ. and as such, this is quite a sufficient reference to a Śaṅ. Maṭha at Kāñcl and also to exclude any other Maṭha like a Veda-Maṭha, as maintained by Mr. Śarmā.¹ The word शंकरार्थगुरु cannot refer to the head of any other i. e. non-Śaṅ. Maṭha. If Prof. K. A. Nilakaṇṭha Śāstrī has not said that it is a Śaṅ-Maṭha,² he has also not said that it is not a Śaṅ. Maṭha. His own reference to Kāñcl Maṭha as one of the 5 Mutts established by Śaṅ., will be discussed later. He refers to the Grants or copper-plates as Kumba. Mutt plates³ just because they were found in the Kumba. Mutt. No other suggestion about them has been made by him. He, however, has not found any reason to doubt its genuineness. Possession is nine points in law and creates a presumption in favour of the possessor unless proved to be otherwise and except surmises and deliberate twisting of the text and its misinterpretation, neither Mr. Śarmā nor Mr. Venkataraman has anything to offer. The main objection of these two main critics, based on the words द्विजन्मने, पोषिहि and शंकरार्थगुरु has been disposed of already. Just because there was a Veda-Maṭha in 1378 A. D. and had a past history also, it does not prove that the Copper-plate Grant was in its favour. If Kāñcl Mutt has

1. *Myth*, pp. 64-65; *JSMV*, pp. 441-42, 434.

2. *Myth*, p. 62 (top para.).

3. *Ibid.*, p. 62 (top).

not been specifically identified in the grant as such, the Veda-Maṭha has also not been identified and even remotely suggested therein. If, without any clue whatsoever, Mr. Śarmā can infer a Veda-Maṭha, why not the Kāñci Maṭha with much greater logical force, with the expressions *संकरादंगुह* and *संकरगुह* as pointers, except for Mr. Śarmā's very strong prejudice against it?

Location

Regarding the location of the Kāñci Mutt, Mr. Śarmā remarks that the reference to Kāmākṣi suggests Śivakāñci but the *Maṭhā*, suggests Viṣṇu-Kāñci.¹ I have, however, not been able to find any reference to or even the word Kāmā. in the text of the grant, as given by Sri T. A. G. Rao or Mr. Rameśan. Why then the *Maṭhā*, should have been brought in here is not clear. And, then, there are so many clear references like पश्चिममठ, काञ्चीपुर, वेगवती (नदी), हस्तिसैलनाथ, हस्तिसैलनिलयपरमेश्वर and so on, pointing to Viṣṇu-Kāñci in the text of the grant. At present, the Mutt is in Śiva. Kāñci, though it was in Viṣṇu-Kāñci, near the Varada-rāja temple, when I first saw it in about 1957/8 A. D. It is not at all unlikely that the location has changed in the course of so many years. The grant refers to the location of the Mutt at the time it was given. Even Mr. Śarmā cannot say with 100% certainty that the Dwārakā and Pūrī Mutts or even the Śrī. Mutt stand exactly at the same place where they were originally established by Śaṅ. and/or they have not changed their original location. This uncertainty of location, however, does not disprove the existence of the Mutts and so in the case of the Kāñci Mutt. Even the Viṣṇu-Kāñci Mutt, referred to in the grant, may not have been as old as the days of Śaṅ. but that only means that the location of the original Mutt is shrouded in oblivion. Hence, simply quoting the opinions and statements of persons like Sri S. V. Venkataraman or Mr. Pantalu to bring in non-existing words like कामकोटि and कामाक्षी and then side-tracking clear expressions like पश्चिममठ &c., all of which point to Viṣṇu Kāñci, is absolutely useless to prove anything for Mr. Śarmā. It has to be borne in mind that we are discussing the location of the Maṭha in the 12th or 13th cent. A. D. and not in recent times. There are records in the west to show that even 50-year old sites, reliably reported to have existed, could not be traced out even by trained researchers.² What the propagandists of the K. Mutt or other books say is immaterial and need not be brought in here, to disprove a Śaṅ. Mutt in Kāñci. Similarly, what

1. *Ibid.*, p. 60 (middle) and *JSMF* p. 452.

2. Vide (i) *Search for the girl with the blue eyes* by Jess Stearn;

(ii) *The Search for Bridget Murphy case* by Marc Bernstein.

the Govt. and/or other records of recent times say or show about such a Mutt site in Kāñci is equally immaterial and the Maṭha's head being or not being in charge of the Kāmākṣī temple is equally so.

Regarding the date and year of the grant, the explanation given by Mr. Rameśan is sufficiently reasonable. He has shown that all the other details in the grant tally with 1111 A. D. Mr. Śarmā argues that the first plate was found in the K. Mutt archives and that it was not sent to the epigraphists for inspection and opinion. These cannot, however, be arguments against its genuineness. Firstly, all the 125 grants or 625 copper plates were found in the Kumba, Mutt and it is quite significant and proper that the first plate was found in the K. Mutt archives rather than elsewhere because all the plates pertain to the K. Mutt. Kaṭitas and the ms. of G. V. K. were found in the Śrāgerī Mutt archives but they do not become fake and unreliable on that account. Not only have they not been submitted to anyone but they are not allowed even to be seen by anyone except a very few persons and that too recently (e. g. Dr. A. K. Śāstry). Secondly, when Mr. Śarmā specifically mentions that Mr. A. K. Śāstry belonged to the Archaeological Dept., he does not care to notice that Mr. Rameśan also belonged to the same dept. of the Andhra Govt. and as such, was quite qualified for a technical inspection of the new plate.

Mr. Rameśan has clearly said that the first plate was discovered some time ago in the archives of the Śrī Kāmakoṭi Pīṭham and that H. H. Sri Candrasekhara Saraswatī sent it to him for examination¹ and yet Mr. Śarmā complains that Mr. Rameśan or the Mutt has not cared to give details as to where this new-found plate was lying all these years, when it was obtained, from where it was obtained and so on.²

Date

Mr. Śarmā argues that if 1111 A. D. is accepted as the year of the grant, the king, who is said therein to have given it in his 16th regnal year, must have come to the throne in 1096 A. D., when Kulottuṅga I was quite powerful and that vassals raised their heads only after his death. As such, the king, who is the donor of the grant and who was just a vassal then, could not have described himself as त्रिभुवनचक्रवर्ती. He must have risen to importance only during the declining years of Cola-rule and as such, he could not have given away a village, as said in the grant.³

1. Śrī K. Kāma. Pīṭham through the ages by Sri N. Ramaśan, p. 12.

2. Vide *Myth*, p. 64.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

Prof. K. A. Nīla. Śāstry tells us that Cola Tikka of Nellore, also called Gaṇḍa Gopāla, assisted Rājendra III against Someśvara in the middle of the 13th cent. A. D., who had sided with the Pāṇḍyas against Rājendra III and thereby strengthened the power of the latter. However, "he took Kāñci for himself as a reward for his services."¹ We do not have a detailed account of the earlier Colas but if this is correct, we cannot put the grant in 1111 A. D. as per Mr. Rameśan but will have to put it either in 1231 A. D. or 1291 A. D., preferably the latter, (because he got Kāñci about 1250 A. D.). In this case, however, it is difficult to explain the fact that this king Gaṇḍa was killed by Sundara Pāṇḍya before 1263 A. D. This also leaves unexplained the discrepancies about the day (Saturday in place of इन्दोवोर: i. e. Monday) and the Nakṣatra (विशाखा in place of अनुराधा-मित्रदेवतनक्षत्र).

In spite of all these points, Mr. Sundaramiah feels like reserving his comment "till I make further researches and study".² Prof. K. A. Nīla. Śāstry "has never found any reason to doubt its genuineness"³ while Mr. Śarmā also says that "it may be true that the Gaṇḍa copper-plate is genuine".⁴

We may note here that these are inscriptions in the Varadarāja temple, referring to Gaṇḍa Gopāla Deva, to prove his connection with Kāñci and most of these inscriptions are in Tamil. This explains the signature in Tamil by a Telugu king. Are these inscriptions also not genuine?

It is also significant that an inscription in the Candramauliśvara temple in Citramaṇa village in Ātmākar Taluq, Nellore District, refers to Gaṇḍa Gopāla Deva as कामकोट्यम्बिकालब्धवरप्रसाद (one who has obtained the favour or a boon from mother Kāmakoṭi). Similarly, a Tamil inscription, dated Śake 1436-1516 A. D. and signed by Candraśekhara Saraswati of Kāñci Maṭha in the Śiva temple at Ambikāpuram refers to the village granted in Gr. No. I, as a मठपुरम् (village granted to a Maṭha) and thereby confirms the grant of Vijaya Gaṇḍa Gopāla in Gr. No. I.⁵

1. Vide *History of South India* by Prof. K. A. N. Śāstry, p. 214; (1991).

2. Vide *Kāmkoṭi. Pradīpam* A Review by Sri K. Sunderamiah, p. 20.

3. Vide *Myth*, p. 62.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63, 67; Mr. Śarmā's contention throughout is not about the genuineness of the copperplate - he accepts it as genuine - but that it is not given to the Kāñci Śaṅkya Mutt Swami (*Myth*, p. 67).

5. Vide *Śaṅkya from a Historical Perspective* by Śrī A. Kappuswamy, p. 4 and also his *Śrī Śaṅkya Bhagavatpradīpācārya*, Preface; pp. XXVIII-XXIX and p. 445 under (1).

It is worth noting that the land granted to the Kāñci Mutt (and not to the Kumba. Mutt, which, even according to the critics, did not exist in the 12th or 13th cent. A. D.) is still being enjoyed by the same Mutt and even more, the Inam title-deed of the village is renewed periodically in favour of the Kāñci Mutt only.¹ If, as said by Mr. Śarmā in particular, this Kāñci Mutt is a branch of the Śṛṅgerī Mutt, why does the main Śṛṅgerī Mutt keep quiet over the matter of possession of the land and renewal of the title-deeds from time to time, when it has tried its best to assert what it claimed to be its own rights in respect of Tāṭaṅka Pratiṣṭhā and going in procession with full insignia not only against the Kumba. Mutt but Kūḍali mutt also?

Regarding certain discrepancies in the text of the grants, the very fact that they exist shows that they could not have been a creation or concoction – much less recent or new – of the Kumba. or Kāñci Mutt because if they were so concocted, the writers would have taken care to see that they did not exist.

Moreover, Śṛṅgerī Inscriptions also disclose such discrepancies in the case of the year and other details as recorded therein, as in the following instances :

(1) In the Hosahalli copper-plate grant, the year has been given in the text as Śaka 1303 = 1386 A. D., the name of the year (वत्सर) being given as रक्ताक्षि, which corresponds to Śaka 1306 = 1384 A. D. and not to Ś. 1303.²

(2) Vengere copper-plate Inscription of Śṛṅgerī Maṭha is dated Śake 1240, Vibhava, Puṣya 5, मकरसंक्रान्ति, Sunday. Actually, however, the tithi occurred on Thursday, 22-12-1328 A. D. In the cyclic year the Śaka year being 1 50, मकरसंक्रान्ति occurred on Monday, the 26th.

The donor Aravidu Vijaya Veṅkaṭapatirāya, son of विरूपाक्षराय and grandson of नरसिंहरायरैया, grants a village Vengere to the holy Mutt of Nr. Bhā. (Donee), disciple of Rāma. Bhā. and grand-disciple (प्रशिष्य) of Gov. Bhā. at Śṛṅgerī for Dī. ārcanā to goddess Śārādāmbā.

The *Mysore Archaeological Report* declares this grant spurious because :

(i) In the year cited, the Vijayanagar Empire had not even come into existence.

(ii) There is no king of that lineage in the Aravidu dynasty.

1. Śrī Śaṅ. Bhagavatpāddācārya by Sri A. Kuppuswamy, Preface, p. xxxi (d).

2. *Uttarakāṇṭha Sanskrit Vidyāranya*, Vol. I, p. 102, footnote.

(iii) Nā Rāma. Bhā., disciple of Gov. Bhā., is found in the list of the Śrīgerī Ācāryas. In fact, there is no Ācārya named Gov. Bhā. in that list at all.

Śaka 1240 corresponds to 1318 A. D. The presiding Ācārya of Śrīgerī Mutt, according to its list, was श्रीविद्यातीर्थ.

(3) There is a copy of an inscription in the Kaṭilā, in the Śrīgerī Mutt. It belongs to the time of Saṅgama, Harihara II. The Inscription is dated Ś. 1316, फाल्गुन शुक्ल 10, Thursday = 1-3-1395 A. D. The grant in the inscription has been given under the king's orders to certain brahmins, in the presence of Śrī Vidyāraṇya Śrīpāda.¹

Here also, the day is actually Monday and not Thursday and the date is too late for Śrī Vidyāraṇya who, according to the mutt-records, passed away in 1386 A. D. only.

The general arguments of the critics are :

(1) There is no name of the Kāñci Mutt (Gr. II and III) or Indra-Saraswatī title (Gr. II, III, IV), only सरस्वती being given in the grants.

(2) The names of the heads of the Mutt have not been given in many grants. If the Kāñci Mutt was the Supreme Mutt, its name must have been known to the authors of the copper-plates (i. e. Grants) and would not have been omitted by them.

(3) Where the names of the heads have been given, they do not tally with those in the Kāñci Mutt list, e. g. चन्द्रचूड is given for चन्द्रशेखर (Gr. I) and चन्द्रशेखर for चन्द्रचूड (Gr. IV). Similarly, the names of the heads do not tally with the dates mentioned in the grant (Gr. No. IV) e. g. चन्द्रचूडसरस्वती of 1521-2 in the grant does not tally with each other. चन्द्रचूड-सरस्वती does not belong to 1520-22 (Śaka era given being 1442=1500 A. D.). It is महासर. who belonged to 1497-1507. Hence, either the संवत्सर 'स्वभाव' or Śaka 1442 is wrong.

Similarly, in Gr. No. II, the donor, donee and the year do not tally with one another. There was no महासर. as the disciple of चन्द्रसर. in

1. For 2 and 3 above, vide *The Śrī. Māṭha* by Śrī B. Krishnan, pp. 26-37.

Mr. Krishnan has drawn upon *Vijayanagar Inscriptions*, Vol. II, Ed. by Dr. B. R. Gopal and published by the Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Govt. of Karnataka (Centenary Publication No. 6), 1986 A. D. In particular, he has cited remarks from K. N. 509, Śrī. M. A. R. 1933, No. 32 for (2) and K. N. 516, M. A. R. 1930, No. 25 for (3).

1686-87 A. D., as the head of the Kāñci Mutt. Hence, most probably, the grants are not genuine.

(4) The word Śaṅkarācārya is not to be found in any grant prior to 1686 A. D. (i. e. Gr. No. X) and whatever is available can apply to the head of any branch-mutt.

(5) In Gr. VII also, there is nothing to show that the donee was an agent of the Kāñci Mutt. He is said in the grant to be just residing in Kāñci and the articles - male and female cloth - mentioned therein disclose a house-holder only, thereby ruling out the surmise that he was a representative of a Mutt.

(6) The काञ्चीशारदामठ has been clearly stated in the grants thus — शारदामठ (Gr. IV), काञ्चीशारदामठ (Gr. V), शारदामठ or लोकगुरुशारदामठ के स्वामी (Gr. VIII). In Gr. IV, we have the words काञ्चीपुरनिवासी, काञ्चीस्थित, काञ्ची-पुरयति.

Now, शारदामठ is the name of Śrī. Mutt itself and as such, शारदामठ or काञ्चीशारदामठ must be a branch of the Śrīgerī Mutt only. The mention of Śārada Mutt in Kāñci in these copper-plate grants is highly suspicious.

Out of these arguments, the first three can be advanced against the Śrīgerī Mutt inscriptions also. It has been already pointed out that in the earlier Vijayanagar grants to Śrīgerī, there is no reference to any Śaṅkarācārya or to the name of the head of the Mutt, nor have Vidyāraṇya and others been referred to as the heads of that Mutt. Discrepancies in the names of the Śrīgerī Mutt heads have also been pointed out in the immediately preceding paragraphs. If the names of the heads of the Kāñci mutt, claimed to be the supreme Mutt ought to have been known to the authors of the grants, the names of the heads of the Śrīgerī Mutt, "the first and foremost mutt" having jurisdiction over the entire South, also ought to have been equally known to the writers. Difference between चन्द्रचूड and चन्द्रशेखर can certainly be ignored as चूड and शेखर mean the same thing, viz. 'crest'.

Regarding the word शंकराचार्य not being mentioned in the grants, it has been shown that the words शंकरार्यगुरु and शंकरगुरु in the very first grant clearly denote Śaṅkarācārya only and not any other person. The statement of Mr. Śarmā is also contradicted by its being found thrice at least - twice in Grant VIII with the words श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यवर्य and काञ्चीपुरस्थित, the actual word in one of the two places being लोकगुरुस्वामुलश्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पादाचार्य-स्वामुल्लु, and once in grant IX, again with the words सत्यव्रतनामांकितकाञ्चीदिव्य-शेखरे शारदामठस्थित श्रीमद् परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्य श्रीशंकराचार्यपूजितचन्द्रमौलीश्वर etc.

In some of these grants, the names of the Ācāryas of the Mutt have been given (Gr. IV, V) while in Gr. VIII, immediately after the words श्रीमच्छंकराचार्यस्वामुलवारिकि and गजारण्यक्षेत्रमद्दु, there is a clear reference to the Śaṅkara's own (स्वान्त) Maṭha and its पूजनैवेद्य etc. going on in that Mutt. This Grant VIII has not been turned down by Mr. Śarmā as not genuine or as being spurious. The words परमपरिव्राजकाचार्य of Śāradā mutt in Kāñci in Gr. IX and the same words with the two names चन्द्रशेखरसरस्वती and महादेवसरस्वती (Gr. X) are clear pointers in the same direction. How much importance should be attached to the decision in Madras G. O. 1260 Public, which expresses surprise that the name शंकराचार्य should not appear in any of the 10 plates now published need not be expressed in so many words.

The argument that if the mention of शं० is there, it can refer to the head of any branch mutt is also pointless because then, it can refer to a principal mutt also and not necessarily to a branch mutt only. And when it has been shown already, and will be shown in the sequel, that the Kāñci mutt and even Kumba. Mutt is not a branch of the Śrīngerī Mutt, the mention will equally apply to the Kāñci Mutt Ācārya also.

Now, both Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkataraman say that there is no reference to a Kāñci mutt in the grants but when the words काञ्चीपुरस्थित and काञ्चीपुरवासी appear in Gr. VIII and काञ्चीपुरनिवासी occurs in Gr. IV, Mr. Śarmā wonders as to why the reference should be there when the Kāñci mutt was so famous.¹ The references to परमपरिव्राजकाचार्य and to Mahādeva Sarasvatī of Śāradā Mutt in Kāñci are beyond any doubt.

Regarding a Kāñci Śaṅ. Mutt, Mr. Śarmā has maintained that there is no reference to such a mutt in the first three grants while the one suggested in grant I cannot be identified with a Śaṅ. Mutt. If, however, the names of the Mutt-heads are there, a mutt must have been there and if the heads could not have pertained to any other order, they must have been the heads of a Śaṅ. mutt only, as suggested by the context.

Now, Mr. Śarmā says there are clear references in grants III, IV and VIII to a Śāradā mutt and Kāñci Śāradā Mutt respectively and then, as according to him, Śāradā Mutt can mean Śrīngerī Mutt only, he has no hesitation in saying that it must be a reference to Śrīngerī Śāradā Mutt only,

1. JSMV, pp. 447, 457. Under Grant No. IV, Mr. Śarmā suggests that the word काञ्चीपुरवासी was added later while under Gr. No. VIII, he says that the reference to Kāñci was not necessary in the case of such a famous mutt like the Kāñci Mutt and that from the same, it is understood that Śrī. (Maṭha) had a branch mutt at Kāñci.

of which Kāñci Mutt was a branch because the Kāñci mutt was never called a Śārada Mutt. He, in fact, says that unless it is proved that the Kumba. Mutt was called Śārada Mutt, the existence of Kāñci Kāma. Mutt cannot be accepted as an independent Mutt established by Śaṅ.¹

Firstly, I have carefully gone through the text of the 10 grants published by Mr. T. A. Gopinath Rao but have failed to find the expressions शारदामठ and कांचीशारदामठ in grants II, III and VIII. The expression शारदामठ occurs in the last two grants IX and X only, out of which the last i. e. X is considered by him to be not genuine. It is not known which text of the grants was followed by him.

Mr. Sunil raises the question as to why the Kumba. Mutt should be called Śārada Mutt² while Mr. R. K. Iyer suggests that the claim to be so called "is evidently a remnant of its once subordination to the Śringerī Mutt." Both argue that the Goddess at Kāñci is Kāmākṣī and the Goddess worshipped in the Mutt is Tripurasundari. "These are distinct aspects of the Divine Mother and cannot be identified with Śārada." There is no Śārada Mandir either at Kāñci or Kumba. while it is there at Śringerī only, and several properties in and around Kumba. are in the name of Śārada Mutt.³

This can be explained in a number of ways :

(1) Firstly, we have to remember that the grants being discussed here do not pertain even remotely to Kumba. or Kumba. Mutt. The various particulars such as सत्यवतीक्षेत्र, वेदवती नदी, एकाग्रेश्वर. दिव्यकाञ्चीक्षेत्र, and so on, specifically mentioned in these grants show very clearly that it is Kāñci only and not Kumba. that is the subject-matter of the grants. It is, therefore, a question of the Kāñci Mutt only, and not the Kumba. Mutt, being called Śārada Mutt. To say so is not in keeping with the contents of the grants. All the argument of Mr. Venkata about the Kumba. Mutt claiming independence of the Śringerī Mutt, and then to be called Śārada Mutt, is, therefore, totally beside the point and anachronistic too, because the Kumba. Mutt started in the first part of the 18th cent. at the earliest.

Regarding Mr. R. K. Iyer's claim "that the Śringerī Mutt at Kāñci is an ancient one",⁴ he has adduced no evidence to prove the same. It

1. Vide *JSMV*, p. 464 (middle, para. 2).

2. Vide the article 'Much ado about nothing' by Mr. K. P. Sunil, *Illustrated Weekly* dt. 13-11-1987, pp. 38-39.

3. For Mr. R. K. Iyer's remarks, vide *Truth*, p. 180.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 180.

is difficult to conceive of such a Śrīgerī Mutt at Kāñci when the existence of the Śrīgerī Mutt as such at Śrīgerī is itself doubtful. Moreover, this claim is found contradicted by the letter dt. 14-10-1942 of Sri K. V. Śrīnivāsa Chariar, officer-in-charge of Śrīgerī Mutt and its properties, who says very clearly that "the building there cannot be considered as a mutt ... and it has not been the intention of the (Śrī.) Mutt to give it any better status, especially because it is the seat of the Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha and it is not advisable to get ourselves into any controversy with that great mutt ..."¹ More comment is needless.

(2) Secondly, the name Śārādā or Śārādā Pīṭha does not appear in the honorifics of the Śrīgerī Mutt. It has been called Śrīgerī Mutt in most of the works except the *Maṭhāmṇāya* published by the Vāṇi Vilāsa Press on behalf of the Śrī. Mutt. Even the additional stanzas cited by the supporters of the Śrī. Mutt as from *Śiva-Rahasya* (Amśa 9, Ch. 14) refer to the Mutt as *शृङ्गेरिकाव्यमठ* only.² Similarly, it has been shown earlier that even their own work *G. V. K.* refers to their Mutt as श्रीमठ at five places and Cidvilāsa also does so at least once.

(3) Thirdly, it has to be noted that none of the many Mutts — Hampi, Virūpākṣa, Avani, Śivagangā and Karavīra, known as branches of the Śrī. Maṭha, are known as so many Śārādā Mutts, though quite some of them have a Śārādā Mandir each. Even the Kūḍali Mutt, which is claimed by some persons to be the real Śrīgerī Mutt, established by Śaṅ. and which has a Śārādā Mandir, is called Kūḍali Śrī. Mutt and not Kūḍali Śārādā Mutt.

(4) Fourthly, all *Śaṅkaravijayas* tell us that Śaṅ. defeated Śārādā (also called therein Vāṇī, Sarasavāṇī etc.), which, in my opinion, took place at the time of Śaṅ.'s ascending the सर्वज्ञपीठ (I have given reasons for this in my article)³ and when he requested her to stay at his mutt, she lent her name to it. (We may say that out of his great regard for her on account of her learning, Śaṅ. immortalised her by naming his mutt after her).

Now, there are two views about the venue of this incident of सर्वज्ञ-पीठारोहण, one of the places being said to be Kāñci.⁴ If this (Kāñci) view is correct, the Kāñci mutt being called Śārādā Mutt is quite easily explained. And this was the only सर्वज्ञपीठारोहण, first and last and no the

1. Quoted in *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.* by Sri A. Saras., p. 152.

2. Vide st. 50 (*JSMF*, p. 644) and st. 49 in *Śrī Śrīgerī Śārādā Mutt* by Mr. K. Sunderamlah, p. 5 (1958 A. J.).

3. Vide my article in *Bhāratīya Vidyā* (Bombay) Vol. LIV, pp. 57-62.

second one, as suggested by Mr. Sarmā because Śaṅ. went to Kāśmīra to meet Maṇḍana Miśra (see Cid.) and not for सर्वज्ञपीठारोहण and that also not at the beginning of his career but at the end of his life as its crowning incident. The venue may have shifted to Kāśmīra later and this also suggests a large gap of time between the ascension by Śaṅ. and then by Abhinava Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and others if any.

It is also worth noting that according to Śrīn. Maṭhā. (Vāṇī Vilās Press), the devatā of the Śrīn. Mutt is Kāmākṣī, its God (देव) being Varāha, both located in Kāñcī. Mr. Śaṅ. Nārā. tries to explain and justify this association of Kāmākṣī and Varāha with Śrīn. Maṭhā but does not contradict it. In that case, however, the question as to why the Śrīn. Mutt should be called Śāradā Mutt can very well be put to its supporters, when it has no connection whatsoever with the सर्वज्ञपीठारोहण.

(5) In the Lalitā cult *Lalitā-Sahasra-nāmāvali* (verse 62) says that Lalitā attained the form of Kāmākṣī at Kāñcī and Kāmākṣī is said to be the 62 nd name of Lalitā. The names त्रिपुरसुंदरी, ललिता and कामाक्षी point to the same goddess viz. Kāmākṣī, who is the presiding deity of Kāñcī and is worshipped as महत्त्रिपुरसुंदरी alongwith चन्द्रमौलीश्वर in the Kāñcī Mutt.

Mr. Śarmā has referred to a deposition in a Court case No. 95/1844, Tiruchirapalli Court by a representative of Kumba. Mutt that Saraswatī (who is the same as Śāradā) was of a lower status than Kāmākṣī and that, therefore, Śaṅ. established a श्रीचक्र in the Kāmākṣī Mandir but not in Saraswatī Mandir (he does not say which). It may here be noted that Lalitā, one of whose names is Kāmākṣī (no. 62 of ललितासहस्रनामावलि) is described as शारदाराम्भ (Name No. 123) while in ललितात्रिशती, Lalitā is said to be served by Śāradā (लम्बचामरहस्तश्रीशारदारिकीजित - Name No. 195). The deposition may be based on these references, and it is not a very serious argument against a Kāñcī Śaṅ. Mutt.

(6) Regarding the name Śāradā Mutt, even if the expressions शारदामठ, कांची शा० मठ etc. were to have been there, it is not at all true that they refer to the Śrīn. Mutt only. Apart from the fact, pointed out earlier, that the expression is not found used for the Śrīn. Mutt elsewhere, except in its own Maṭhā. (Vāṇī Vilās Press), it is not true that it refers to a Śrīn. Śāradā Mutt, of which the Kāñcī Mutt must be accepted as a branch.

(i) Firstly, it is not true that the expression शारदामठ applies to Śrīn. Mutt only. It is found applied to the Dwarakā Mutt also in (i) मठेतिवृत्त (ii) महाभगवत्सेतु (J. S. M. V. pp. 648-50) (iii) मठा० from Adyar (iv) महा-

म्यायोरनिबद्ध and (v) आम्नायस्तोत्र while it is applied to the Śrī. Mutt in its own मठाम्नायस्तोत्र and श्रीमठाम्नाय from Adyar, in addition to Śrī. sponsored or approved books like *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom, Greatness of Śrī.* and *Śrīgerī*. It may also be noted that in all the first 5 Maṭhām-nāyas Śrī. Mutt is called Śrī. Mutt only.

Then, the *Vimarsa*, a Dwāarakā mutt book, refers to the Dwāarakā Pīṭha as Śāradā Pīṭha (see pp. 26, 27, 30, 89 etc.) while श्रीद्वारकाशारदापीठगुरुपरम्परा published by that mutt and श्रीशङ्करदिग्विजयसार, published by श्रीनवभारती कार्यालय, राजकोट (सौराष्ट्र), refer to द्वारकामठ as श्रीशारदापीठ. Sri Ramapati Miśra in his letter dt. 1-4-1935 to पण्डितपत्र, says clearly that it has still not been decided whether Śāradā Mutt is Śrīgerī or Dwāarakā (p. 5).¹ Is the Dwāarakā mutt also a branch of the Śrī. Mutt on this account ?

In fact, it will have been noticed so far that the Śrī. Mutt is called by the name Śrī. Mutt much more than by the name Śāradā Mutt, which has been applied to it by Śrīgerī approved works only. The evidence of the *G. V. K.* and *Cid.ya* to the contrary (reference to the Śrī. Mutt as श्रीमठ) has been adduced already.

Then, again, when Mr. Śarmā insistently points out that the Kāñcī Mutt has not been specifically mentioned in the grants, he has to explain why the Mutt has been called Kāñcī Śāradā Mutt as per his own statement and not Śrī. Śāradā Mutt even once if that was the first and foremost Mutt and the only one for the entire South, particularly when Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkaṭa, point out that at least 5 out of the 10 grants have been given by the Vijayanagara kings and on the strength of which Mr. Śarmā suggests that they must have been given to the Śrī. Mutt only, Kāñcī Mutt being only its branch. The surprising thing is that there is not the slightest detail to support such a suggestion. Thus, the 10 grants mention a number of places like विरुपाक्ष, कुम्भकोण, काञ्ची but not Śrī. even once. Similarly, in none of the 10 grants, there is the slightest, remotest or the most indirect reference to Śrī. or to the Maṭha there being a branch of that Mutt or to any detail that would suggest Śrī. or the Śrī. Mutt. If the Śrī. Mutt were such an important Mutt and if the Kāñcī Mutt were just a branch thereof, this total non-mention is not properly explained nor has Mr. Śarmā attempted to do so. That neither Kuṇḍali nor Kumba. mutt is a Tuṇḍu i. e. branch or subordinate Mutt of Śrīgerī Mutt has been shown already on the basis of court-decisions in suits filed by the Śrī. Mutt itself.

1. Read: अब तक यह नहीं निश्चय हुआ कि शारदा मठ शृंगेरी है या द्वारका । p. 5, last line.

In connection with the contention that the Śārada mutt in Kāñci, referred to in the grants, is only a branch of the Śrī. Mutt, one constant argument of Mr. Śarmā and also Mr. R. K. Iyer is that the Kumba. Swāmī has been called Sikka or Chikka Udayar i. e. Junior Swāmī. According to them, Chikka Udayar Swāmī necessarily implies that there was a Dodda (great or senior) Udayar Swāmī who is the Śrī. Maṭha Swāmī and hence the Kāñci mutt is only a branch of the Śrī. Mutt.¹

Now, while it is true that the Kumba. Swāmī has been called Chikka Udayar Swāmī by the Courts of law, it can never apply to the head of a Śaṅ. Mutt in Kāñci, if any, for the simple reason that even according to both these critics, the Kumba. Mutt, which came into existence in the last decade of the 18th cent. A. D. (about 1791 A. D.) at the earliest, simply did not exist at the time of the grants, nor did the courts of law, the latest of the grants being much prior to the establishment of such a Kumba. Mutt — prior by more than a century. As said earlier, while discussing the remark of Mr. Sunil and Mr. Venkaṭa, the grants have nothing to do with Kumba. or a Kumba. Swāmī, all of them pertaining strictly to a mutt at Kāñci.

Secondly, the Śrī. Swāmiji has nowhere been called a Doḍḍa Udayar Swāmiji. If he had been so called, even the Swāmī of Kūḍali Mutt which, according to the Śrī. Mutt, was one of its branches only, ought to have been called Chikka Udayar Swāmī, at least when both these mutts confronted each other as opponents in the Courts, but this has never happened. The same rule applies to Śivagaṅgā and other mutts also against which the Śrī. Mutt appeared in Courts of law. The conclusion seems to be obvious.

The expression Chikka Udayar Swāmī applied to the Kumba Swāmī has to be and is actually explained in a different manner. Kumba. Mutt is a branch or extension of the Kāñci Mutt, which is the real Chikka Udayar Mutt and its head a Chikka Uḍa. Swāmī, and it is so called because God Ekāmreśvara in Kāñci is called the Doḍḍa Udayar Swāmī. According to tradition, both have been entitled to 1/96th part of the land-tax payable to Govt. This tax is called Merai and it is called Chikka Udayar Merai and Doḍḍa Merai according as it is payable to the Kāñci Mutt Swāmiji and to God Ekāmreśvara. It is to be so paid by land-holders in some tāluks around Kāñcipuram. No other mutt, not even the Śrī. Mutt, has this right. The judgment of Sir John Wallis, C. J. and Justice Mr. Ayling of Madras High Court, 1917, testifies to the existence of this right.²

1. *Truth*, Pt. I, p. 179; *Myth*. p. 19

2. (i) *Śrī Śaṅ. Bhaga.cārya*, by Śrī A. Kuppuswamy, Preface, p. xlii;

(ii) *Some Judicial references etc.* by Śrī N. K. Reddiar, p. 6; (1947).

Mr. Śarmā has produced one judgment on the file of Dist. Court, Chingleput (respondent K. Mutt head) of 1935, wherein the Court has examined the claim of the Kāñcī Pīṭhādhipati as the Plaintiff that he was given by the ancient Hindu Rājās the right of Merai over all the villages in the suit and several other villages in this (i. e. Chingleput) District, that the successor Mahomedan Govt. confirmed and continued the grant and the British Govt. also thereafter recognised and continued it under their treaty with the Nawab about 1797 A. D.

The judgment in what appears to be the final appeal was that (i) no grant from Hindu Rājās was produced by the Kāñcī Mutt nor any confirmation by the Mahomedan kings or the British Govt., and (ii) that the Plaintiff has produced no evidence to prove the (existence or) exercise of such a right during the 130 years from 1800 A. D. to 1930 A. D. (when the appeals were filed in the Court). The Court also observes that "the Chikka Uḍa Swāmī is a powerful person in the Tanjore Dt. and it is hardly likely that if any claim was to have been made on this Shrotriem (i. e. Merai), it would not have been made long ago. The inference ... which I draw from the circumstances is that the right itself never existed."

Mr. Śarmā observes at the end that inspite of the above judgment of 12-8-35, the Kumba. Kutt propagandists say that they still hold the Merai right, that "among the rights conferred by the Cola king of yore, the one surviving is that of legal collection of a portion of Govt. kist in some tāluks near Kāñcī. This is called the Kerai right and is recognised by successive civil Courts." To say so is, according to Mr. Śarmā, a disrespect to Courts.¹

In the absence of the original court-case papers, it is difficult to say anything decisively in the matter but the following points should be noted :

(i) While stating the plaintiff's claim that the Merai grant was recognised and continued by the British Govt., Mr. Śarmā has quoted from the judgment two sentences, viz., "continued the merai grant ... and this was the condition which the British Govt. attached to the shrotriem grant. This last is part of the case strictly relevant to the appeals."² Now, it seems to be clear that the gap in the quotation (indicated by dash —) represents some part of the judgment which must have contained the condition mentioned in the following sentence and which is said to have been relevant to the appeals. When Mr. Śarmā has quoted the judgment at great length from as many as

1. *Myth*, pp. 105-107; for the three paragraphs,

2. *Myth*, p. 106.

6 paragraphs thereof, the reason for his omitting this part, which is material and hence important, is not clear. An adverse inference that it affected his argument cannot be avoided.

(ii) The earlier judgment of Sir John Wallis and justice Ayling of Madras H. C., 1917, recognising the right of Merai with regard to some Tāluku round Kāñcīpuram, clearly says "that the evidence justifies the inference that this payment of the disputed merai had a lawful origin and was not merely voluntary." On the strength of this, the Kāñcī or Kumba. Mutt is quite justified in holding that the mutt still holds the merai-rights. And then, instead of the K. Mutt disrespecting the Courts, is it not the Chingleput Dist. Court, certainly a junior one, going against the earlier decision of a division Bench of the Madras H. C., thereby involving a far greater disrespect by the Junior Court towards the Senior Court, unless the circumstances of the case are otherwise and have been suppressed by Mr. Śarmā? The 1917 case was between the Kāñcī Kāmakōṭi Mutt as plaintiffs v/s 3 Śrotriendars of three Śrotriem villages in the Chingleput Dist.

The case of 1917 A. D. also answers the observation of the Chingleput Dt. Court regarding the Kumba. Mutt Swāmī not making any claim in respect of this Śrotriem (i. e. Merai) long ago i. e. prior to 1929-30 A. D. It was made at least more than 12 years ago.

Further, the Chingleput Dist. Court seems to contradict itself when it says that "the Matha was fighting for the Merai since 1817 A. D." (unless this is a misprint for 1917 A. D. which refers to the case mentioned in the previous paragraphs) and also when it says that "the matha agents must have been trying to extend the area of collection of this Merai"¹ which implies the existence of some basic area of collection over which their right extends. The year 1817 A. D., if correct, also goes against the stand of the critics of the Kumba. Mutt that it came into existence for the first time in 1821 A. D. only.

Regarding the non-exercise of the right for 130 years,² it can be said that it was not so exercised because of the absence of the Kāñcī Swāmiji from Kāñcīpuram during that period—even for about 200 years prior to 1930 A. D., though the right belonged to the Kāñcī Mutt.

Lastly, Mr. Śarmā utters not a single word about the Śrī. Swāmiji not being called a Dodda Uda. Swami anywhere. He has simply taken it

1. *Ibid.*, p. 106 (para. 33).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 106 (para. 10).

for granted and so has Mr. R. K. Iyer. Otherwise, they should have said where such a reference is found. Similarly, they keep mum on the point of distinction between Dodda Uḍa. and Chikka Uḍa pertaining to Lord Ekāmrānātha and Kāñcī Swāmiji respectively, and Chikka Uḍa. only secondarily to Kumb. Swāmiji.

The conclusion from all this discussion about the expression 'Chikka Uḍa. Swāmī' being applied to the Kumba. Swāmiji is, I think, quite clear and obvious for everyone.

Thus, if as Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Veṅkaṭa. say, there was nothing like a Śaṅ. Mutt at Kāñcī till about 250 years prior to 1960 A. D., when the Upaniṣad Brahmendra Mutt, the first Advaita Mutt came up there and the Kumba. Mutt was an independent and a new Mutt in the 19th cent A. D., the reference to a Śāradā Pīṭha or Śāradā Mutt in Kāñcī, as far as the grants are concerned, is not understood at all. Secondly, if, as Mr. Śarmā says that the Śāradā Mutt of Kāñcī, if there existed any, was another Maṭha, promoting Advaita philosophy and the Śāradā Pīṭha and Maṭha at Kāñcī were both the branches of the original Śrīngeri Pīṭha and Maṭha, this amounts to an admission of the existence of a Śaṅ. Mutt at Kāñcī in the 12th or 13th cent. A. D. and onwards and then, if the Śaṅ. Mutt is to be accepted as a branch of the Śrī. Mutt, the grants which disclose such a mutt there will have to be accepted as genuine. Or, are they to be accepted only if the mutt they disclose is admitted to be a branch of the Śrī. Mutt? Thirdly, in that case, what about there being no Advaita Mutt prior to the Upaniṣad Brah. Mutt? Or, was the Śrī. Mutt not an Advaita Mutt? Fourthly, who established this branch and when? Obviously, it must have come into existence sufficiently prior to the time when the earliest grant was given i. e. 12th or 13th cent. A. D. And, then, what is the evidence for all this? Neither Mr. Śarmā nor Mr. Veṅkaṭa has furnished any thing beyond their personal surmises. In fact, the position of the Śrī. Mutt itself, prior to 1346 A. D. was, as seen already, quite anomalous. It was just a cluster of hermitages, and as such, it cannot be said to have established any branch at Kāñcī. Whatever branches of the Śrī. Mutt are there today, have come into existence due to, and from the time of, Sri Vidyāraṇya Muni and not earlier. Lastly, it has been shown that the word Śaṅkarācārya occurs in grant VIII (in addition to grants IX and X) who is clearly said to have his own Mutt where worship of चन्द्रमौलीश्वर etc. was being carried on in addition to feeding, propagation of learning and so on¹

1. Even Mr. T. A. Gopinath Rao has referred to these functions — vide *Copper-Plate Inscriptions of Śrī Śaṅ. of Kāma. Pīṭha*, p. 9; (1916 A. D.).

and all this is referred to Kāñcī by name and by other words which point to Kāñcī. In all this, there is absolutely no reference to or suggestion of the Śrī. mutt or subordination thereto.

All this discussion, it is felt, is more than enough to show that not only there was a Śaṅ. Mutt in Kāñcī but also that it was an independent one and not a branch of the Śrī. Mutt, inspite of the expression Śāradā Mutt found used twice in the said grants.

Allied to this question of the Kāñcī Śaṅ. Mutt, is the question of Kumba. Mutt which too has become quite controversial. The stands of the two parties — the K. K. Mutt and its critics — have been stated at the very beginning of this discussion. Thus, the Kumba. Mutt is, according to the critics, no extension or continuation of the Kāñcī Śaṅ. Mutt as claimed by its supporters but is one of the many mutts which came up under the aegis of some principal i. e. Āmāya Mutt but later gave up their allegiance and declared their independence. The Kumba. Mutt in particular started claiming direct establishment by and descent from Ādi. Śaṅ. for the Śaṅ. Mutt in Kāñcī was later on shifted first to Tanjore and then to Kumba. for reasons of political unrest.

Now, neither Mr. Śarmā nor Mr. Veñkaṭa. has produced any tangible and trustworthy evidence to prove that the Kumba. Mutt was started under the banner of the Śrī. Mutt and whatever they have said about it in the nature of Chikka. Uḍa. Swami or "a stranger to Kāñcī" or Kāñcī Śāradā Mutt has been disposed of already.

Mr. Śarmā just throws out one suggestion to connect the Kumba. Mutt with the Śrīgerī Mutt. He says that according to an old work called पल्लवचरित्र, written some 200 years prior to 1935 A. D. i. e. about 1735 A. D. (but still not published), the Śrī. Ācārya (name not given) had sent to Tanjore one श्रीमहादेवसरस्वती alongwith his own Śrīmukha with a directive to the Tanjore king that the Gold image of Kāmākṣī be sent back to the Kāmākṣī temple in Kāñcī. What happened thereafter is not given in the पल्लवचरित्र.¹ Mr. Śarma then argues that if this account in पल्लवचरित्र is accepted, it would not be wrong to infer that Mahā. Saras., sent to Tanjore, stayed there only and the king retained him there with respect. It is gathered from history, Mr. Śarmā says further, that there was no friendly relationship between Śrīgerī Mutt and Tanjore though there was no open conflict either. Possibly (संभवतः) this Mahā. Saras. became the first Ācārya of the

1. For the account of पल्लवचरित्र, vide JSMV, pp. 229-230.

Kumba. Mutt and started his lineage.¹ According to Mr. Śarmā, whatever चरित्रसामग्री (biographical material) is available so far (i. e. till 1961 A. D.), shows that the Kumba. Mutt became initially established in Tanjore in the beginning of the 18th cent. A. D. and then going over to Kumba. in the early part of the 19th cent. created a Mutt there in 1821 A. D.²

The पल्लवचरित्र referred to by Mr. Śarmā has not come to light so far nor was it seen by Mr. Śarmā himself. He is quoting it on the authority of one Mr. S. Iyer, the editor of तत्त्वनिधानम्, Madras. Now, as said by Mr. Śarmā, the book was a palm-leaf ms. written in Tamil and said by the said editor to have been written about 1735 A. D. Mr. Śarmā quotes this work in connection with the return of the gold-idol of Kāmākṣī (स्वर्णकामाक्षी) to Kāñci, but he is not consistent about when it was taken out of Kāñci for reasons of political unrest there. While he gives the time as about 1690 A. D. between 1695 and 1710 A. D. in *JSMV*, he gives it as about 1760 A. D. in his later book *K. K. Mutt — A Myth*.³ In the latter, he gives many details about this time and if that is true, पल्लवचरित्र, written about 1735 A. D. could not have described or referred to the return of that idol to Kāñci.

Regarding Mahādeva Sarasvatī sent by Śrī. Swāmiji, we are not told the name of that Swāmiji. Moreover, what happened thereafter is not given in the said पल्लवचरित्र. Thirdly, if the Tanjore king was instrumental in starting the mutt at Tanjore, subsequently shifted to Kumba., the Śringerī Mutt has nothing to do with it and hence, this new mutt cannot be said to have been established by the Śringerī Mutt nor can it be said to be its branch. Fourthly, if the mutt was initially started at Tanjore, it cannot be called the Kumba. Mutt. At the most, it can be so called predicatively or in anticipation. Thus, even if पल्लवचरित्र account is accepted as true, it does not explain the establishment of a mutt at Tanjore initially.

Regarding Mahā. Saras., if he was sent by the Śrī. Mutt for a specific purpose, why did he overstay at Tanjore, why was he allowed to do so by the Śrī. Ācārya and why was he not called back to Śringerī? Was he a Sannyāsin when sent to Tanjore by the Śringerī Ācārya, being invested with that name? If so, was he so named in anticipation of his becoming a Śaṅkaracārya of a branch mutt at Tanjore and then what is the evidence for all this? Moreover, even if the Yoga-paṭṭaka Sarasvatī is available to Śrī. Mutt, there is not a single Ācārya in the Śrī. Mutt list bearing

1. *JSMV*, p. 230 (last para.).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 421.

3. *JSMV*, p. 230 (top); *Myth*, p. 80 (last para.).

that yogapaṭṭka. In that case, why was an exception made in the case of Mahādeva Saraswatī? Saraswatī is mostly used by the Kāñcī mutt for its Ācāryas. Then, again, how did Mahā. Saras. become the first Ācārya of the Tanjore Mutt? Who appointed him as the first Śaṅkarācārya of that Mutt and what was his own status and right to do so? The Tanjore king could obviously not have done this.

Thus, all these statements, like many others, of Mr. Śarmā are his sheer baseless surmises (see the repeated use of the word संभवतः in this context) with a persevering motive to connect the Tanjore-cum-Kumba. Mutt with the Śrī. Mutt and make it a branch of and subordinate to the latter. Secondly, it is a deliberate attempt to deny the shifting of the Kāñcī mutt first to Tanjore and then to Kumba. Mahā. Saras. was the first Ācārya of this new mutt but he was not the same as the one sent by the Śrī. Ācārya and hence this new mutt was neither a branch of nor subordinate to the Śrī. Mutt. In fact, it is the contention of Mr. Śarmā that the said mutt, first established at Tanjore, was shifted to Kumba. with the assistance and patronage of the Tanjore king and that this was brought about by the said king as a set-off against the Śrīgerī Mutt because that Mutt was suspected to have sided with Tipu Sultan who was an enemy of the Marāṭhās, Tanjore also being a Marāṭhā kingdom then. To say against this that the Kumba. mutt came or was brought into existence under the aegis of the Śrī. Mutt Gurus will be just like saying that the Kūḍali mutt came into existence some centuries later (than the time of Vidyā. Muni) under the guidance and encouragement of the Śrī. Gurus and emperors. The position of the Kūḍali Mutt vis-a-vis the Śrī. Mutt has been discussed already. Kings do not bring into existence institutions like mutts; they only help those that are already there.¹

Mr. K. R. Venkataraman has a slightly different explanation for the rise of the Kumba. Mutt. He says : A group of Sannyāsins comes into prominence in Gov. Dixit's time. One of them is patronised by the Maratha rulers of Tanjore. In 1821 A. D., the then prince builds for him a Maṭha at Kumba. and a few years later, performs Kanakābhiṣeka to the then Swāmī. Thus shot into prominence and backed by royal support in Tanjore, these Swāmīs, like other Maṭhādhipatis, big and small, happened to receive Rahadāris for their tours from the local chiefs and later on from the East India Co. also."²

1. In this connection, read *Śūradā and Śaṅ. at Śrī.* by Sri Śaṅ. Nārā. p. 51 (last para.).

2. *Truth*, p. 249 (last para.)

It is really surprising to read such a statement from the pen of a person like Mr. Venkataraman. Almost every part of the statement requires to be supported by evidence but the author has produced not even a scrap of it anywhere in his book. What led the Tanjore king to select a Sannyāsin from that group, what was his name, in which year he was selected and what authority he had to appoint him as a Śaṅ. and of which mutt — all these points have been left moot by the writer. Moreover, this is an unheard of way of appointing a person as a Śaṅ. It is only an existing Śaṅ. of some mutt and none else that is supposed to be authorised to do so. Which Śaṅ. did it and to which mutt did he belong? Again, it is quite clear from the statement that there was initially nothing like a mutt in Tanjore which was subsequently shifted to Kumba. in 1821 A.D. He does not even suggest that Gov. Dixit or any of his descendants had anything to do with this whole affair of an altogether new Śaṅ. and a new mutt. Lastly, this statement contradicts the earlier statement of Mr. R. K. Iyer that the Kumba. Mutt is one of the many mutts that first came into existence under the aegis of some principal i. e. Āmṇāya mutt — the Śrī. Mutt in the case of the Kumba. Mutt — but which in course of time threw up that allegiance and declared their independence.¹ It also contradicts the statement of Mr. Śarmā that a mutt was first established at Tanjore with the help of the Tanjore king and also that Mahā. Saras., who was sent to him by the Śrī. Ācārya and was retained by him there with respect, but who was obviously not one of the group of Sannyāsins mentioned by Mr. Venkataraman became the first Śaṅ. of the mutt at Tanjore.

Mr. Venkataraman also says that the Ācāryas of the Kumba. Mutt for the last two centuries have been drawn from the group of Kannadigas only.² Mr. Venkataraman's book was published in 1965 A.D. and as such, this places the first or the earliest Ācārya in or before 1765 A.D. He himself refers to one of the Ācāryas, viz. चन्द्रशेखर सरस्वती as reigning from 1814-51 A.D. This Ācārya was obviously not the first and as Mr. Venkataraman starts from Kumba. Mutt only in 1821 A.D., this once again contradicts his own idea of the Tanjore ruler patronising one of the group of Sannyāsins and building for him a Mutt at Kumba. in 1821 A.D. only.

Regarding Rahadārīs, we find that these and certain Inams also were issued in the name specifically of one person only, viz. Śaṅkarācārya of Kāñcī Kāmakoṭi Mutt, Kāñcī or Conjeevaram. Mr. Kappuswami has pointed out the following records in this connection :

1. *Truth*, pp. 3-4.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 248 (1st para. middle).

(1) A firman issued in Persian by Fidi Safdar Ali Khan Mohamad, confirming that the village of Pūrnambalam is given as a Śrotriem to Śaṅkarācārya Gossain ... from the year Fasli 1157 (= 1737 A. D.).

(2) Daud Khan's (a mansabdar of the Imperial Court and holding the post of naib between 1700 A. D. & 1708 A. D.) gift of a taxfree village to enable the Swami (Śaṅkarācārya Swāmi of the Kāma Pīṭha) "to maintain himself and to pray to God in peace", was confirmed by the successors of his in the Nizamat of the Subah of Arcot.

(3) A Firman issued by the English East India Company, dated 25 Shaban, 1206 A. D. (18-4-1792 A. D.) ordering that the Great Guru Śaṅya Swāmi Mahant ... will be going from Kumba. to Chennapatnam ... and that none should collect tolls etc. "

(4) Bapu Rao, Marāṭha translator of Col. Mackenzie, in his report dated 10-4-1817 A. D. speaks of the Ācārya of Kāñci (whom he had met) as the chief priest of Śaṅkarācārī).

(5) Two letters, one from the British Resident, Mr. Blackburn at Tanjore to Raja Sarfoji and one from the Raja to the said Resident in connection with seeking the opinion of Śaṅya at Kumba. on the position of the image ... etc. Both the letters are dated 19-9-1806 A. D.¹

The two firmans mentioned above (1 and 3) are taken from the *Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission* (Vol. XXII, pp. 72-73).

In addition to these, Mr. N. K. Reddiar (Retd. Madras H. C. Judge) has cited true extracts from 4 Inam title deeds with regard to Inam lands granted to, and in the possession of the Kumba. Pīṭham Śaṅkarācārya Mutt at Kāñci, in the village of Kudiyataudalam (Arcot Dt.), Tiruvoriyar (near Madras) and in the village of Madhavaram (Saidapet Taluk).² Mr. Reddiar remarks on these extracts thus :

"On a perusal of these extracts it will be fully clear that the Inam lands specified in the title have been in the enjoyment of the Mutt from ancient times and the titles have been given and renewed in the names of 'Kāñcīpuram Śaṅkarācārya Swāmi Matha' and Kāñci Kāmakoti Pēṭhā-

1. For items 1 to 4, vide *Śūn. from a Historical Perspective* by Sri A. Kuppuswamy, pp. 10-11.

2. *Judicial references etc.* by Sri N. K. Reddiar, pp. 28-33.

dhīpati Śrī Śaṅkarācārya Swāmīgal, irrespective of the place of residence of the Swāmīs of the Mutt.”¹

It has to be noted that these title-deeds are all dated from 1862 A. D. to 1870 A. D. and while the place of residence has been given as Kumba., the Śaṅkarācārya has been referred to as Kāñci Pīṭhādhipati. The pieces of evidence adduced above lead to the following conclusions :

(1) Firstly, the Swāmī or the head of the mutt in question has been clearly identified, as said by Mr. Reddiar, with the Śaṅkarācārya as the Kāñci Kāma. Pīṭhādhipati, whatever the place of his residence, which has been mentioned as Kumba. alongwith this explicit reference to the Swāmī by name. This shows the very close connection - nay, identity of the Kāñci Mutt and Kāñci Swāmī - with the Kumba. Mutt. This lends support to the contention of the K. K. Mutt about shifting of the mutt from Kāñci to Kumba., though its date may be uncertain.

(2) Secondly, the Inams and Rahadārīs pertain to a period prior to 1708 A. D., showing that the grantee Śaṅ. Mutt must have been in existence long before that time. These Inams again continue to be enjoyed by the Kāñci. Mutt even to the present day.

Similarly, the two letters dated in 1806 A. D. between the British Resident, Mr. Blackburn and Rājā Sarfoji of Tanjore² as well as the Report of Śrī Bapu Rao dated 10. 4. 1817 show that the mutt at Kumba. proper must have been in existence there much prior not only to 1817 A. D. but also prior to 1806 A. D. Hence, its being shifted to Kumba. from Tanjore, as per Mr. Śarmā or being started there altogether anew, as per Sri K. R. Venkṭa. in 1821 A. D. cannot be true and hence cannot be accepted. If, as Mr. Venkṭa. says, the Swāmīs shot into prominence after 1821 A. D., how are all these documents of a much anterior date accounted for ?

(3) Thirdly, the evidence also shows the existence of a Kāñci Pīṭhādhipati Śaṅkarācārya and of course his Mutt at Kāñci from as early as 1700 A. D. and the complete absence of the slightest reference to the Śrī. Mutt in any of these deeds shows that both the Kāñci and Kumba. Mutts were not branches of that (i. e. the Śrīgerī) Mutt nor were they subordinate to it.

The theses of both Mr. Śarmā and Sri K. R. Venkṭa regarding the origin of the Kumba. Mutt and/or its relation to or connection with the Śrī. Mutt cannot be sustained in the least.

1. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

2. *Śaṅ. from a Historical Perspective* by Śrī. A. Kappu., p. 17.

The main idea of the critics of the Kāñci Mutt in opposing or denying their theory of its shifting to Kumba. is to deny the existence of any original Śaṅ. Mutt in Kāñci and one of their major arguments in favour of their own contention is that the K. Mutt people propose a number of dates for the said shifting, implying that none of them is true because, in fact, there was no such thing as a Kāñci Mutt and hence no question of its shifting or the variation in the dates of shifting which never took place but is simply sought to be maintained somehow.

Now, there is no denying that no exact date or year has been given for the shifting of the Mutt by the persons concerned. If, however, we look to Indian history, some variation is found in the dates of very important persons and events. We, therefore, have to be often satisfied with some kind of approximation to dates than the exact details. The dates of the original shifting of the mutt as mentioned by Mr. Śarmā himself roughly range from 1729 to 1760 A.D.¹ while 1821 A.D. is the other date given by himself and Mr. Veṅkaṭa as the year of shifting of the mutt from Tanjore to Kumba. and as that of the establishment of a totally new mutt at Kumba.

Mr. Śarmā himself has been varying his own stand in this matter. Once he says quite definitely that there was no such thing as a Śaṅ.ya Mutt or an Advaita Mutt in Kāñci prior to the Upaniṣad Br. Mutt (some 250 years prior to 1939 A.D. i. e. about 1690 A.D.)² and hence there was no question of its shifting. While discussing the grants, however, he seems, as shown earlier, to be forced to admit the existence of a Śaṅ. (Śāradā) Mutt in Kāñci and then he has no hesitation in dubbing it as a branch of the Śringerī Śāradā Mutt.

Secondaly, Mr. Śarmā says that, initially the so-called Kāñci Mutt came up as a Mutt in Tanjore in the early part of the 18th cent. A.D. and that later on, it was shifted to Kumba. in 1821 A.D. Now, if what he calls the Kumba. Mutt come up first in the 18th cent. A.D., it does not tally with his affirmation that there was no such thing as a Kumba. Mutt before 1821. The contradiction between his statement that the Tanjore king snapped his relations with the Śrī. Mutt and brought into existence the Kumba. Mutt as a set-off against the Śrī. Mutt and his assertion that the Kumba. Mutt started as a branch of the Śrī. Mutt has been pointed out already. Mr. Śarmā's proposing as many as four or five hypotheses - all sheer guesses and

1. *Myth*, pp. 19-20.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

all of them absolutely untenable – about Mād.'s authorship of S. Ś. Jaya has been discussed in a separate article.¹

Similarly, the total disagreement – almost contradiction – between the two different hypotheses of Mr. R. K. Iyer and Mr. Venkṭa. about the origin of the Kumba. Mutt has also been pointed out elsewhere.

If Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Venkṭa. can make such contradictory statements, which cannot be reconciled with each other, neither of them has any moral right to find fault with others only because the dates do not exactly tally – dates which have been given by different persons at different times – as against the statements made by the same persons and in their own book or books.

Then, again, we have already seen Śrī. Mutt shifting its own stand regarding the date of Śaṅ., and the adherents of that same mutt like Prof. Umesh, Mr. Śarmā, Mr. Venkṭa., who cannot be brushed aside as just “some persons”, have also done nothing but added to the variations. The wide range of difference on this point among great scholars is too well-known to need any special mention.

Lastly, if we look to the various *Śaṅkara Vijayas*, we find that there are great and material variations among them in the matter of some very important incidents in Śaṅkara's life, regarding the exact timing thereof and also the actual accounts of some incidents. Thus, Śaṅ.'s mother's death, Śaṅ.'s encounter with Maṇḍana's wife and his परकायाप्रवेश, Śaṅ.-Gauḍapāda meeting, come under the first head while the initial encounter between Śaṅ. and Maṇḍana, Śaṅ.-Vyāsa meeting, the actual route of Śaṅ.'s Triumphant Tour and so on, come under the second head. The maximum that can be gathered from those varying accounts is that they took place in Śaṅ.'s life, many of their details being subject to doubt. The same reasoning can be applied to the question of the date of shifting of the Kāñci Mutt to Kumba. I was told at Kāñci that the Kumba. Mutt built a new Pūjā Gṛha there in the matha in 1821 A. D. and that this was being construed by the critics as the year of the establishment of the Mutt itself. The existence otherwise of the said mutt much prior to 1821 A. D. has been shown already.

In fine, the theory of shifting of the Kāñci Mutt to Kumba. in the earlier half of the 18th cent. A. D., that the grants do disclose a separate Śaṅ. Mutt at Kāñci from very early times, though its exact location might have changed subsequently and has been changing even till recent

1. Vide my article “*Saṅkṣepa Śaṅkara Jaya of Vidyāranya Muni*”, *JUB*, Vol. XLI, No. 77, November 1972, pp. 1-23.

times and that neither this Kāñci Śaṅ. Mutt nor the Kumba. Mutt later was a branch of or subordinate to the Śrī. Mutt seems to be far more tenable and hence acceptable than the one held and propounded by Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkaṭa or Mr. R. K. Iyer (Part II & Part I resp.).

Regarding the actual possession of the grants by the Kumba. Mutt, Mr. Suderemiah remarks that " it may be safely said that the alleged possession of the grants in the hands of the chief priest of Śaṅ. cārī of Kumba. Agrahāram should have been only as trustees or agents of the Śrī. Mutt."

According to Mr. Śarmā, who holds that the Kumba. Mutt was unrelated to the Kāñci Śaṅkarācārya Mutt, if ever there was any,¹ says that " it was said that some Copper Plates (i. e. grants) were in the possession of the workers of the Śrī. Mutt branch (at Kumba.) and from them, they were procured by the Kumba. Mutt workers".² Regarding this criticism, a number of points require to be explained. They are :

(1) Firstly, Mr. Śarmā's statement means that the Śrīgerī Mutt had a branch of its own at Kumba. while the Kumba. Mutt, discussed above, is also said to have been a branch of the Śrī. Mutt. This means that the Śrī. Mutt had two branches at Kumba. and if so, what was the propriety or purpose of having two branches at the same place? The Śāradā Mutt at Kāñci, which is unrelated to the Kumba. Śaṅkarācārya Mutt, then becomes the third branch of the Śrīgerī Mutt, if Mr. Śarmā is to be believed. And, then, what is the evidence for all this?

(2) Secondly, if the 625 copper-plates found with the Kumba. Mutt were only some of the copper-plates left by the Śrīgerī Mutt in the hands of the workers of its branch Mutt at Kumba., it is obvious that they were not all the copper plates then possessed by the Śrī. Mutt. The question then is : how many more copper-plates were there and in the possession of the Śrīgerī Mutt and what has happened to them? What was the total number of copper-plates in that case? Neither Mr. Śarmā nor the Śrīgerī Mutt has said anything about these points.

(3) Thirdly, how were so many as 625 copper-plates – such a priceless possession – left or allowed by the Śrīgerī Mutt to be in the hands of the workers of a branch mutt, away from the head-quarters? If this is really

1. *Sri Śaṅ. Śāradā Mutt* by Sri K. Sundēramiah, p. 19.

2. *Truth.*, pt. II. p. 247.

3. *JSMV*, pp. 429-430. Mr. Śarmā remarks that the remaining i. e. 115 grants were possibly destroyed or converted into vessels because they were inconvenient to Kumba. Mutt, *JSMV*, p. 429; *Myth*, p. 60 (top).

so, does it not reflect very poorly and adversely on the Śringeri Mutt authorities concerned?

(4) Fourthly, how did even the workers of the Śringeri Mutt branch allow such a valuable possession to be taken away from them? Why, again, was no action whatever taken by the principal Śringeri Mutt to recover them, when they came to know about it? Again, what is the evidence for all this? Mr. Śarmā seems to think that making some guesses (संभवतः) and suggesting some plausible alternatives, without trying to see how tenable or otherwise they would be considered to be or to adduce at least some prima facie evidence to be bear them out is all that he, as a critic, has to do. The effect of Mr. Bapu Rao's report has been pointed out already.

(5) Lastly, Mr. Śarmā questions the genuineness of at least some of the copper-plates now published. If, however, they were, all of them, initially in the hands of the Śrī. Mutt, how does Mr. Śarmā explain this? Or, are they to be called genuine if, when and so long as they are in the hands of the Śrī. Mutt but not so if they are in the hands of the Kumba. Mutt? In the latter case, did the Kumba. Mutt fabricate them and if so, how is it that they did not take care not to leave any lacunae therein? Moreover, they, have been made out specifically - at least some of them - in the name of Kāñci Śaṇya Mutt only and neither the Kumba. Mutt nor the Śrī. Mutt, which is said to have been there.

Mr. T. A. Gopinātha Rao calls these copper-plates ancient. Mr. Śarmā points out some other copper-plates of a still earlier date or period but not belonging to the Kāñci Mutt, and then questions the propriety of these copper-plates being called ancient.¹ It is, however, not understood as to how these copper-plates, if they are really of a very old period and hence called ancient, cease to be so even if some other copper-plates happen to be as ancient as or even more ancient than these copper-plates. All this only serves to show how the whole question of the Kāñci Mutt is being tackled by the critics in the name of सत्यान्वेषण (search for the truth).

Moreover, even like the Śaṅkarācārya image with six disciples below in a standing posture in the compound of the Kāmākṣi temple, there is in the old Pūjā-room inside the Kāñci Kāma. Mutt (at present in the Salāi street, Śiva Kāñci, Kāñcipuram), another image just similar thereto, with Śaṇ. seated and flanked by 6 disciples, 3 on each side in a standing posture.²

1. JSMV p. 431.

2. Śaṇ. from a Historical Perspective by Sri A. Kṛṣṇa. p. 7 (enā) and p. 8 (top).

Similarly, below the above image, there are two Gopuras of two different periods, the upper one of the 12th cent. A. D. and the lower one of the 8th cent. A. D. (Saṅgama period). This structure has been recovered half only, the other half being in the closely adjacent mosque-building. But the portion available also shows the existence of a Śaṅkarācārya mutt at the very site at such an early date.¹

Then, a mutilated Tamil inscription in three stones on the walls of the present Śaṅ. Mutt in Salai street at Kāñci of the period of Kampana has also been found. Archaeologists opine that the inscription belongs to the early seventies of the 14th cent. (i. e. 1371 to 1380 A. D.). In one of the disarranged stones, the two letters in Tamil (*rya*) are seen. On the other two stones, the letters (मठ) have been found. Probably, *rya* is a part of the word शङ्कराचार्य and then the reference to the Śaṅ. Mutt becomes quite clear, at least prima facie.²

Other Arguments :

A number of other arguments of a more or less general nature have been advanced by the critics of the K. K. Mutt. The more important and material of these are as follows :

(1) The Banāras Vyavasthā :

Both Mr. Sunderamiah and Mr. Śarmā have laid a lot of emphasis on what they have called the Banāras Vyavasthā (also called Kāśī Vyavasthā) of 1886 A. D., according to which the Banaras Pandits declared very clearly and emphatically that Śaṅ. established 4 Mutts only and not more than 4.³ Mr. Sunderamiah connects this Vyavasthā with the tour of Mahādeva Sarasvatī, the 63rd Ācārya of the Kumba. Mutt, about 1886 A. D., when, according to him, the Kumba. Mutt people started making the new claim about the Kāñci Mutt being established by Śaṅ., and as such its supremacy over all

1. This information was given to me at Kāñcīpuram when I had been there in 1992 A. D.
2. *Śaṅ. from a Historical Perspective* by Śrī. A. Kuppu. p. 6 (end) and p. 6 (top). In addition to what I have cited above, Mr. Kuppu. has given a number of other pieces of evidence — inscriptional and structural — in his two books, viz. *Śaṅ. from a Historical Perspective*, pp. 4-8 and *Śrī Śaṅ. Bhag.rya* (Ch. XVIII *Śaṅ. ya sculptures*, pp. 148-153). It may be stated here, for whatever it may be worth, that I have personally seen a number of the Śaṅ. sculptures in Kāñci in Kāmākṣī, Varadarāja, Ekāmrēśvara and Vaiṅkuntā Perumal temples though not all cited by Mr. Kuppu. and others
3. *Myth*, p. 15; *JSMF*, pp. 407-08; काशी में कुम्भ-मठविषयक विवाद R. G. Śarmā and *Śrī Śrī. Śrāṇā Mutt* by Śrī K. Sunderamiah, p. 15.

other Mutts and so on. He says, "Such a new claim seems to have irritated also the learned scholars, Mahants and Maṭhādhipatis at Banāras. Hence, at a conference of Pandits and Maṭhādhipatis, held in Banāras in 1886 A. D. and known as the Banaras Vyavasthā of Vikrama Śaka, it was resolved that Ādi Śaṅ. founded only 4 mutts and that the new claim of the Kumba. Mutt was thereby negatived."¹ This resolution was later confirmed with greater vehemence in 1934 A. D.² Mr. Śarmā remarks that it was decided at the second meeting that they could not go back upon their decision in 1886 A. D. The decision of the Pandits was based mainly on the *Mādhaviya* and the *Maṭhāmnāya* which only were regarded as authoritative in the matter.³

All this seems to suggest as if the Vyavasthā came into existence only to counter the claim of the Kumba. Mutt that a 5th mutt was established by Ādi Śaṅ. at Kāñci. The position, however, is as follows :

The Banaras Vyavasthā came into being to consider whether the Mūla-bāgala Mutt was the original Dwārakā Mutt established by Ādi Śaṅ, as claimed by one Sri Sadānanda Tīrtha Swāmī of Mūlabāgala, who claimed that he was the real head of the Dwārakā Mutt. And, then, the decision was given by the Pandits of Banaras that Śaṅ. established 4 mutts only, at Dwārakā, Kedāra, Purī and Śringerī and that there was no 5th Mutt like the Mūla-bāgala Mutt, established by Śaṅ. The preamble to the decision of 1886 A. D. gives this background, which shows clearly that the Banāras Vyavasthā of 1886 A. D. had nothing to do with the validity or otherwise of the Kumba. or Kāñci Mutt. The followers of the Śrī. Mutt, however, have all along been saying that this exclusion of the 5th mutt pertained to the K. K. Mutt, which, therefore, was not, according to them, established by Ādi Śaṅ.⁴

1. *Śrī Śrī. Śārada Mutt* by Sri K. Sunderamiah, p. 15.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

3. *JSMV*, p. 53 (end).

4. Vide (i) काशीव्यवस्था and *Ramāpati Mīśra's letter to पण्डितपत्र* 1-4-1935, p. 1, para. 1.

(ii) Read : प्रकृत 'विमर्श' पुस्तकारम्भे व्यवस्था कचिदेभिः, तिरोधाय पूर्वसंदर्भं, प्रकाशं नीता ।... इयं व्यवस्था श्रीकामकोटिपीठं विषयतया न स्पृशति । आत्मानमेव द्वारकापीठाधीशं अभिदधाने मूलबागलुमठाधिपतिमधिकृत्यैव तस्याः प्रवृत्तिः ॥ श्रीशाङ्करपीठतत्त्वदर्शनम् p. 16.

(iii) *Śrī. Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Inst.* by Sri A. Saras., p. 148, para 3.

It may be noted that Mr. Śarmā has referred to this criticism of the *Banārasa Vyavasthā* and he then points out that there were 4 issues before the Sabha of 1886 A. D., last of which pertained to the number of Mutts established by Śaṅ. and that all the Pandits concurred in their decision that Śaṅ. established 4 mutts only. He then maintains that this decision refers to all Śaṅ. Mutts in general throughout India. (*Myth* p. 113).

At the time of Kāñcī Kāma. Ācārya's visit to Kāśī in 1934 A. D., there was a section of opinion there headed by Pandit J. G. Viśvanātha Śarmā, which did not accept or favour the claim of the K. K. Mutt and its people and they brought about another meeting of Kāśī Pandits on 30-9-1935 at the Biharipura Mutt, specifically to examine and decide about the Kāñcī Mutt claim that it was established by Ādi Śaṅ. Then, the decision about Śaṅ. having established 4 mutts only and no fifth one, taken by the Kāśī Pandits in 1886 A. D. was cited and the Sabha declared that they could not go back upon the decision of 1886 A. D. and then the *J. S. M. V.* 1934 affirms again and again that the Kumba, or Kāñcī Mutt was never established by Śaṅ. Now, when the 1886 decision did not pertain even remotely to Kumba. or Kāñcī mutt, it is worth considering how far it was correct to invoke the decision of 1886 and apply it to the K. K. Mutt. The decision of the Biharipura Mutt Sabhā can at best be said to be its own view in the matter viz. that according to the Kāśī Pandits of 1934 A. D. Sabhā, Śaṅ. did not establish any mutt at Kāñcī. All these decisions, however, of 1886 and 1934 have been expressly based on the *Mādhaviya* and the *Maṭhāmnāya*, which according to all these Pandits, are the only reliable authorities in the matter and when both these have been shown to be not that reliable historically, the validity of the decision, particularly of 1934 A. D. will be questionable. Some thing more about this will be said at the end.

(2) Another argument always put forward is as to why Rāmānujācārya, who was a resident of and a student at Kāñcī, did not seek out the Kāñcī Śaṅ. ya if he were there. Why did he go somewhere else for clarification? The suggestion is that this was because there was no such Śaṅkarācārya of any Kāñcī Mutt.

In the first place, Rāmānuja may not have been very hopeful about getting any satisfactory explanation from a Śaṅkarācārya from whose Advaita he differed. In fact, if we go through his biography, we find that he never desired to have any kind of clarification on the points on which he differed from Śaṅ. (e. g. interpretations of passages like कप्यास, सत्यं ज्ञानं ब्रह्म, तत्त्वमसि etc.). He appears to be quite sure of his own interpretations and did not think it necessary to get any clarification. And hence no question of his seeking out any Śaṅkarācārya.

Rāmānuja was a student at Kāñcī in his youth. Yādavaprakāśa, a follower of the Śāṅkara-school of Advaita-Vedānta, is said to have met him at Kāñcī but did not like to disturb his studies and hence went back. Thereafter, Rāmā. had differences with Yādava. and being summoned urgently to Śrīraṅgam, he went there to become the head of a Māṭha at

that place. Thereafter, he travelled widely, preaching the Vaiṣṇava Cult. He never returned to Kāñci after his departure for Śrīraṅgam in his youth. Mere non-mention of his trying to contact the then Śaṅ.ya at Kāñci can, therefore, be no proof that there was no Mutt and no Śaṅ. at Kāñci.¹

Moreover, the very same question can be put to the Śrī. Mutt followers also. Maybe, there was no Kāñci Śaṅ. Mutt but if the Śrī. Mutt had, as they claim, a branch of their own at Kāñci from ancient times and if Śrī. Mutt catered to the needs of the entire southern region, which included Kārṇāṭaka and Tamil Nadu, why did Rāmā. not seek out the Śaṅ.ya of this Śrī. branch Mutt at Kāñci for clarification of his points or doubts?

Similarly, the same argument applies to Madhvācārya and Akṣobhyamuni of his fold (Sampradāya). Madhva also, like Rāmā., had his early training in the Śāṅkara system of Vedānta and he also broke away from that system and built up his own, based on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. He was just 40 miles away from Śrīrgerī² and yet he did not seek out Śrī. Ācārya for an explanation and yet this is not considered enough to prove that there was no Śāṅkarācārya or a Śāṅkarācārya Mutt at Śrīrgerī.

The same reasoning is true of Akṣobhyamuni's not seeking out Kāñci Ācārya for disputation. Why did he not seek out Śrī. Mutt Ācārya at Kāñci as the representative of the only Śāṅkara spokesman of the South?

(3) Mr. Śarmā has another query as to what the Kāñci Ācāryas were doing when Buddhism and Jainism were spreading. And once again, this same question can be put to Mr. Śarmā and the other supporters of the Śrī. Mutt. According to the Śrī. Mutt, Śaṅ. was born in 44 B. C. and Sureśvara, the direct and formidable disciple of Śaṅ., was then living. Why did he not try to stem the tide of these two religions? If they argue that they have since revised the date of Śaṅ. to 788 A. D., no Kāñci Śaṅ.ya also could have been in existence then and the same argument will apply to them also. Even if, accepting the Kāñci view of the regnal periods of their Ācāryas, Mr. Śarmā were to argue that 16 Kāñci Ācāryas were living in Kāñci from 127 A. D. to 710 A. D., the golden period of Buddhism, one cannot expect each and every Ācārya to be capable of counteracting the influence of some leading Pandits of those faiths that are likely to have been there at that time. All this is negative reasoning, which is not sufficiently strong to show that no Śaṅ.ya and no Śaṅ. Mutt existed at Kāñci.

1. Vide (i) *Life of Śrī Rāmaṇujācārya* by Swami Rāmakṛṣṇānanda, and
(ii) *History of South India* by Prof. K. A. N. Śastry.

2. *History of South India* by Prof. K. A. N. Śastry, p. 481;

(4) Regarding Tipu Sultān and Nawab of Walajah asking the Śrī. Swāmiji in 1791 A. D. and 1763 A. D. to consecrate the chariot festival etc. and to decide the Chettiar's dispute respectively, it is clear that the Kāñci Mutt had been shifted to Kumba. definitely much prior to 1763 A. D. (Tātañka Pratiṣṭhā was performed by the Kumba. Ācārya in 1757 A. D. only) and hence, there was no Kāñci Swāmiji present in Kāñci at that time.

Secondly, Tipu was obliged to the Śringeri Ācārya for whatever the latter had done for him by performing for him a great sacrifice for his success against his enemies and hence Tipu must have obviously asked him to do the consecration.

There was no question of any kind of right involved in either of the two cases, over which the Kāñci mutt could have started a quarrel and a Court-case. The two cases do not, therefore, suggest in any way or bear out the non-establishment or non-existence of a Śaṅkarācārya Mutt at Kāñci.

(5) The Kumba. Ācārya being called "a stranger to Kāñci" when he entered Kāñci in 1838 A. D. also can be explained by his absence from Kāñci during about 140 years from 1700 A. D. to 1838 A. D. and not by saying that there was no Śaṅkarācārya Mutt at Kāñci.

(6) Regarding Appayya Dīkṣita's making no reference to Kāñci Mutt, even though he lived very near thereto, it has to be seen whether in his highly philosophical works, there was any occasion for him to do so. Even like the Kāñci Śaṅ. ya mutt, he makes no reference to the Śrī. Śaṅ. ya Mutt branch also, which is said to have been there from ancient times.¹ *Argumentum ex silentio* has always to be used with great care and caution. Mere non-mention does not necessarily suggest non-existence. On the contrary, it has been seen already that even the *Śaṅkara Vijayas* wherein such a reference not merely to one mutt but at least to 4 mutts was necessary and expected, do not make any such reference and that leads to queer and unpalatable deductions.

(7) Another argument or charge against the Kumba. Mutt is that after they succeeded in the Tātañka Pratiṣṭhā case in 1844 A. D., the Mutt's Ācārya returned to Tanjore in 1846 A. D. (it is not clear why he is said to have gone to Tanjore when the Tanjore king had already helped them with a regular Mutt at Kumba. in 1821 A. D.) and started preparing or concocting a false Guru-paramparā and books like *Br. Ś. V.*, *Prācīna Śaṅkara Vijaya* and other propaganda literature, and propaganda through press and plat-

1. *Truth*, p. 183.

form to propagate their tall but false claims and secondly by tampering with and preparing embellished versions of works like *Śiva-Rahasya*, *Ānandagiriya*, *Vyā.ya* and so on from the middle of the 19th cent. A. D.¹ Mr. Sunil charged the late Paramācārya (Śrī Candra. Saras. Swami)² with having started all this activity but when it was pointed out that Paramācārya was born in 1894 A. D. and became the head of the Kāñci Mutt in 1907 A. D. when was just 13 years old, Mr. Sunil revised his statement by saying that the activity was at least encouraged by him.³ Mr. R. K. Iyer was more cautious when he said that the present occupant of the Mutt (he means by it Paramācārya) is no doubt not the originator of these claims but is certainly responsible "for their propagation by allowing the supporters to use his name and his "kind permission" and the dedication of the works to him.⁴

A further charge is that the K. Mutt people have tampered with the aforesaid books to give a new biography altogether of Śaṅ., which is derogatory to him.

Now, regarding the works like *Br. Ś. V.*, *Pr. Ś. V.* and *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa* and so on and even about the works like *Śiva-Rahasya*, *Ānandaya* and *Vyā. ya*, enough has been said already and need not be repeated here.

Regarding distorting the biography of Śaṅkara, it is not understood how mentioning a separate location for certain incidents in his life becomes derogatory to him. Regarding the particulars of the birth-place and the names of the parents of Śaṅ. in *Ānandagiriya*, the point has been clarified already. Regarding Śaṅkara's ascending the सर्वज्ञपीठ, it has been described at Kāñci by Cidvilāsa, Govindanātha and Brhmananda Saras. (not to mention *Br. Ś. V.* and *Pr. Ś. V.*) who were not pro-Kāñci writers nor are their works the productions of the K. K. Mutt. The works of Cidvilāsa and Govindanātha at least have come out prior to 1800 A. D.

On the contrary, the supporters of the Śringeri Mutt may be asked as to whether the stories of the initial wrangle between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana⁵

1. *Myth*, p. 2; and *Truth*, p. 190.

2. Vide the article "Disputed Lineage" by Mr. K. P. Sunil, in *Ill. Weekly*, 13. 9. 87, p. 13.

3. Vide the article "Much Ado about nothing" by Mr. K. P. Sunil, *Illus. Weekly*, dt. 13. 12. 87, p. 39.

4. *Truth*, pp. 4-5.

5. Mr. Sarmā has tried to answer the charge against the writer of *Ś. Ś. Jaya* by saying that he has simply tried to collect together or compile what had

(Continued on the next page)

(at least Śaṅkara's participating in it), Śaṅkara's forgetting the purpose of his entering the body of Amarūka and remaining there beyond the time-limit, set by himself before his disciples, his intended stay in the new body, that he had to be reminded of his duty by his disciples, the way he answers the first query of Govinda Muni as to who he was – that he was not the 5 elements and so on –, his not recognising the identity of Vyāsa, which had to be pointed out to him by his disciple Padmapāda, when he is himself described as lord Śiva incarnated in human form – does all this not sound derogatory to a character, which has been exalted to the level of the Divine? And all this is found in the *Mādhaviya*.

Regarding putting up false claims, it may be conceded that some of them like the Kāñcī Ācāryas only being जगद्गुरु and other Ācāryas being Gurus only or Kāñcī Mutt being the permanent superintending authority over all the other Śaṅ. Mutts, which are, therefore, always subordinate to it etc. may not be tenable, while some claims like Kāñcī Mutt being गुरुमठ, all others being शिष्यमठ; etc. have been misunderstood. But the K. Mutt has at least not tried to appropriate to itself the rights and privileges of other Mutts like Kūḍali, Śivagaṅgā, Virūpākṣa and Kumba. as the Śṛṅgerī Mutt has been shown to have done in these cases, resulting in a number of Court-cases, in most of which, the Śṛṅgerī Mutt has not succeeded. Their attempt twice to have removed all the references to the Kāñcī Mutt – G.V.K. – 5 Mutts and the book on Śaṅkarā by a writer from Pordichery – and lastly, their attempt to declare Kūḍali and Kumba. Mutts as being branches (Tuṇḍu mutts) of the Śṛṅgerī Mutt have been described already.

Lastly, if Paramācārya of Kāñcī is said to have at least encouraged propaganda to boost up the claims of the K. K. Mutt and to denigrate the Śṛṅ. Mutt, Śrī Nīlakaṇṭhaṇ and Śrī Anantānendra Saras. have said that the origin of the whole controversy can be traced to the period of उग्रनृसिंहभारती VIII of Śṛṅgerī Mutt¹ (1817-1878 A. D.) and was further intensified during the period of his successor (1878-1912 A. D.) and Śrī Abhinava Vidyā Tīrtha (1954-1989 A. D.).²

(Continued from the last page)

come down by way of hearsay (*JSMV*, p. 155), just as he has tried to dilute the other defects in the *Mad. ya*, i. e. *S. Ś. Jaya* on the ground of its being a poetic rendering of Śaṅkara's biography (*Ibid.*, pp. 186, 193, 195). He, however, does not say whether all this befits a person like Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni, to whom this *Mādh. ya* has been attributed.

1. (i) *Vide Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.* by Śrī Anantā. Saras., pp. 137, 141, 143;
(ii) *Śrī Śaṅ. and the Mutts etc.* by Śrī K. Nīla., pp. 1-2 etc.
2. *Vide Śrī Śaṅ. and Insti.* by Śrī A. Saras., p. 153.

(8) Another argument or contention of Mr. Śarmā is that Śaṅkara did not establish anew any श्रीचक्र at Kāñcī but he only renovated the one that existed there already. According to him, the word Kāmakoṭi means Cakra and Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha is here from time immemorial and was created or established by Śaṅ. and Śrī. cakra was not created or established by him anew at Kāñcī. but was only purified and renovated by him.¹

Kāma. Pīṭha cannot mean Kāma. Maṭha either because there could not be two Maṭhas (Śrī. and Kāñcī) under the same Dakṣiṇa Āmnāya. As Śaṅ. had already established the Śrī. Maṭha for the Dakṣiṇa-Āmnāya, he cannot be said to have established another - Kāmakoṭi - Maṭha at Kāñcī under the same Āmnāya. If, however, the Kāñcī Mutt is said to be a residential place for Yatis, Mr. Śarmā has no objection thereto.²

Mr. Śarmā seems to feel that the establishment of a new Śrī Cakra (निर्माण) at Kāñcī, somehow involves the admission of or implies the establishment of a separate Āmnāya Mutt at Kāñcī by Śaṅ. and he is at pains to resist the idea repeatedly. Whatever the implication, however, and the bearing of this on the question of the establishment of an Āmnāya Mutt at Kāñcī, it may be pointed out that at least 4 out of the 16 or 17 Śaṅkara Vijayas expressly mention such as establishment (निर्माण) only - and not mere renovation (पुनःप्रतिष्ठा) - by Śaṅkara of a श्रीचक्र at Kāñcī. They are :

(1) Anantānandagiri is, of course, the earliest biographer, who mentions it as follows : (1) श्रीचक्रनिर्माणं क्रियते भवद्भिराचार्यैः । तस्मात् ... श्रीचक्रं भवद्भिः आचार्यैः निर्मितमिति ॥ इति श्रीचक्रनिर्माणं नाम ... ॥ Ch. 65. And this is found in the Bibliotheca Indica Edn. of his Ś. V. of 1868 A. D. and not in the "embellished" one only.

(2) Brahmānanda Sarasvatī in his Br. Ś. V. clearly states that Śaṅ. himself established the Śrī Cakra in front of Kāmākṣī, known on the earth as Kāmakoṭi. Thereafter, the same author goes on to tell us that Śaṅ. established there a Maṭha also for the residence of the Ācāryas. (Part I : Ch. XXIV).³

1. Vide JSMV, pp. 469 to 471; The other references are : JSMV, pp. 370, 503, 508/9; Myth, p. 23 (top).

2. Vide JSMV, p. 471 (middle).

3. Read : कामाक्ष्याः पुरतो भूम्यां कामकोटीति विश्रुतम् । चक्रराजस्वरूपं तु श्रीचक्रं स्वयमालिखत् ॥ The Goddess Kāmākṣī was established at the back of this Śrī Cakra (श्रीचक्र-पश्चाद्भागे तु कामाक्षीं स्वयंनिर्मिताम् ।). Thereafter, the work also tells us that Śaṅ. established there only, a Mutt for the residence of the Ācāryas आचार्याणां निवासार्थं सुरेन्द्रपादशासनात् । मठं बहु विचित्रादयं विस्तारायामसंयुतम् ॥ All this is from Ch. XXIII, Pt. I of Br. Ś. V. of ब्रह्मानन्द सरस्वती.

(3-4) *Cid.ya* and *Bhagavatpādābhyudaya* also testify to the establishment of a Śrī Cakra by Śaṅ. in front of Kāmākṣī whom he established at the back. The latter also tells us that Śaṅ. established a Maṭha also at Kāñcī for the advancement of learning (विद्याभिवृद्धये).¹

All the other *Ś. V.s* are, however, silent on the point of establishment of Śrī Cakra at other Pīṭhas, including Śringerī.

(9) Mr. Śarmā has listed a number of works in none of which, he says, is there any reference to a mutt established by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī. These works are in addition to the 16 or 17 *Ś. V.s* and they are : (1) *Keralotpatti*, (2) Sudhanvan's Copper-plate, (3) *Rājatarangiṇī* (4) *Ś. V.s* of Jagannātha, Rāmakṣṣṇa, Bālakṣṣṇa Brahmānanda and *Ś. Dig. Sāra* of Vrajarāja. Out of the last 4 works, Mr. Śarmā had not seen the first three, but had procured a ms. copy of the last work. None of these works is available today. But Mr. Śarmā tells us, on the authority of some North Indian scholars, without mentioning their names, that they mention 4 Āmnāya Mutts only, but none of them mentions away 5th Āmnāya Mutt as having been established by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī.² What Mr. Śarmā did with the copy of the last work he procured is not known.

Mr. Śarmā has not seen the first three works at all and depends upon what some unnamed scholars say. Looking to the other *Ś. V.s*, most of which do not mention any mutts at Dwārakā, Badarī and Purl at all, it is difficult to decide how far the Northern scholars and even Mr. Śarmā quoting their opinion can be depended upon. At the most, we can suspend our judgment till we come to know more about the writers themselves, the time when they wrote their works and the contents thereof. Moreover, Mr. Śarmā describes *Keralotpatti* as अप्रामाणिक (unauthoritative) and अग्रह (not acceptable) and yet cites it for the non-mention therein of any Mutt of Kāñcī.³

(10) Another charge against the Kāñcī Mutt is that its work *Suśamā* (commentary on *G. R. M.*) has said that Sure. was disqualified for being appointed as the head of any mutt because he was not a परमहंस-संन्यासी.⁴ *Suśamā* gives two reasons for saying so, viz. (1) that he had

1. Read : (i) कामाक्ष्याः पुरतो देशे श्रीचक्रं स्वयमालिखत् । Cid. XX : 35. Then, att. 36 to 43 describe the श्रीचक्र and then we have : श्रीचक्रपश्चाद्भागे तु कामाक्षीं ज्ञानरूपिणीम् । प्रतिष्ठाप्य ... । Cid. 44, 45; (ii) श्रीचक्रं स्थापयामास श्रीकामाक्ष्याः पुरो गुरुः । भगवत्पादाभ्युदय VIII 79. The second line of this same stanza tells us that Śaṅ. established there a Maṭha also for the advancement of learning. Read : सः च स्थापयामास तत्र विद्याभिवृद्धये ॥ भगवत्पादाभ्युदय VIII 79.

2. For Mr. Śarmā's comments on the 4 works, vide *JSMV*, p. 231 (top).

3. *Ibid.*, p. 224.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 232 and p. 393 (top).

not become a Sannyāsin suo moto and from ब्रह्मचर्य, and because such a परमहंस only was (qualified) to occupy that seat i. e. the seat of a Mutt head and (ii) that he had become a Sannyāsin as a result of a bet between Śaṅ. and himself, even though he was the top-most person among all the learned persons.

It is here worth noting that Mr. Śarmā quotes from सुषमा only to the effect that Sure. was not a परमहंस-संन्यासी and hence was not made the head of any Śaṅ. Mutt and then quotes Mr. K. R. Venkātā. as saying that Sure. was initially a householder (Grhastha) and hence not a परमहंस and then quotes सुषमा as saying that he was not a परमहंस because he became a Sannyāsi as a result of a bet.

Mr. R. K. Iyer gives two quotations from सुषमा which give both the reasons cited earlier for saying that Sure. was not a परमहंस but while explaining, mentions only the first one about the bet and quotes Mr. N. K. Venkāteśan to give the other reason.¹

As a matter of fact, सुषमा gives both the reasons for his not being called a परमहंस and not one only, as done by Mr. Śarmā and Mr. R. K. Iyer, both of whom quote another person for giving the second reason, the person being different in each. It is also to be noted that both the writers, Mr. Śarmā and Mr. Iyer, have quoted the सुषमा incompletely and they have particularly dropped the words स्वयं ब्रह्मचर्येण अपरिगृहीतपारमहंस्यतया तादृश (परमहंसैकसमभ्यासनीये जगद्गुण्य स्वमते शिष्यपीठेषु वा न निवेशितः ...) which are really very material. It seems clear that according to सुषमा, becoming a Sannyāsin from ब्रह्मचर्याश्रम and that too by one's own volition (and not under compulsion) were the technical requirements of being called a परमहंस and it is likely to be similar to the (technical) definition of a नैष्ठिक ब्रह्मचारी, which even Bhiṣma cannot be said to have fulfilled though unreservedly acclaimed by Lord Kṛṣṇa himself to have been a true life-long celibate - a ब्रह्मचारी till death (निष्ठा(मरण)पर्यन्तं = नैष्ठिक). It is well-known that the Guru-paramparā of Kāñcī (and of Śrī. as well) is one of ब्रह्मचारीसंन्यासी and not गृहस्थसंन्यासी. I have cited this argument or charge of the critics particularly because it shows at least to my mind, how these critics treat or look at the whole subject of the K. K. Mutt.

In addition to the arguments considered and discussed so far, there are some more which, in my humble opinion, do not seem to have any adverse bearing, if any, on the question of validity or otherwise of the fifth Śaṅ. Mutt at Kāñcī.

1. Vide Truth, pp. 81-82.

(1) That the Kumba. Mutt is a comparatively modern mutt, that it is a branch mutt only and that it has had 4 or 5 Ācāryas — all these points may be conceded but in a particular way. The Kumba. Mutt came into existence in the earlier part of the 18th cent. A. D. (and is quite a recent one), as a branch or continuation of the Kāñcī Śāñ. Mutt and naturally did not have more than 4 or 5 Ācāryas till 1886 A. D., 4 Ācāryas being added thereafter.

(2) That the Kumba. Mutt never had any right over the Kāmākṣī temple¹ or that the Gold-image of Kāmākṣī was not taken out of Kāñcī by the Kāñcī mutt people but by others are quite unrelated to the issue of the Śāñ. Mutt at Kāñcī.

(3) The image in the compound of the Kāmākṣī temple is originally said to be that of Buddha, whose image was converted into Śāñ.'s image by removing the tuft of hair (*śikhā*) on the head.² How Buddha's image had a tuft of hair is indeed not known but even here, the point may be conceded and even that it is not necessarily the Samādhi sthāna (burial-place) of Śāñ. Even Paramācārya was not particular about holding that it was so and in fact held that the exact burial place of Śāñ. is not known though according to him also, Kāñcī is the place where he laid down his body perhaps in front of the Kāmākṣī image as per Anantā. According to Mr. Śarmā, the existence of a Samādhi structure inside the compound of a temple of a Devayoni Goddess is against the scriptures.³ Even though this is immaterial, the fact is that the compound of the temple was extended long after the raising of the samādhi structure, which was thereby brought inside the temple compound.

Opinions of Scholars etc.

Lastly, we have the quotations and opinions of very famous, eminent and learned scholars like Pandit J. Nehru, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Dr. Sir C. P. Rāma. Iyer, Dr. Sampūrṇānanda and others cited in this connection

1. Read here, Mr. Śarmā's remark that "for Kumba. Śāñ. to become Kāmakoṭī Jagadguru Śāñ. maintenance of Kāma. Piṭha was essential." (*JSMF*, p. 523).
2. Vide *JSMF*, p. 498 (end); p. 505; Mr. Śarmā's argument is that the image has six disciples below the image above. Śāñ. had 4 disciples only while Buddha had 6 disciples. This, however, is not correct. Dhana. Surin, in his commentary on *Mādhyā* (XV : 1) mentions by name so many disciples of Śāñ. Moreover Udaṅka and Citsukha were among his principal disciples and with the other 4, we have six principal — at least important — disciples.
3. *JSMF*, pp. 136, 175, 490 etc.

of the number of Mutts, by the critics of the K. K. Mutt to the effect that Śāṅ. had established in India only 4 (Āmnāya) Mutts and not more.

At the very outset, I have to say that I have the highest respect for all these eminent and famous scholars, the various learned Pandits of Kāśī and other places, and the various eminent and learned judges whose opinion has been cited by the critics. I, however, wish to submit that this subject has now become a highly specialised one, needing a special study of the various sources of information, now available in connection with the same. When these various writers made their statements and expressed their opinions, not even 25% of the books, particularly the Ś. V.s, were available for examination. Moreover, even they would have conceded that they had made their statements only on the basis of the limited information that was generally available to them, without making any special attempt to gather all possible information on the subject and then make a critical analysis and assessment of the same before expressing their opinions and this was for the simple reason that this was not their special field of enquiry, research or study. As such, it is, in my opinion, not correct to cite these scholars as authorities in the matter nor are their statements or opinions binding on research students of the present day, with a lot of new sources of information and texts now available to them.

Moreover, in some cases at least, the opinions of different scholars seem to cancel each other. A few instances are :

(i) Dr. Burnell thinks that the *Ānanda.ya* (i. e. *Anantā.ya*) "seems to be quite a modern work, written in the interests of the schismatic mutts on the Coromandel coast"¹ and Mr. R. K. Iyer discards it as valueless and obviously a forgery.² On the contrary, Prof. Wilson says that "it bears internal and indisputable evidence of being a composition of a period not very much removed from Śāṅ." and hence can be taken "as a very safe guide."³

(ii) *Mādhavīya* is regarded as one of the two most authoritative works bearing on Śāṅ.'s life and is taken as the bed-rock of the Śringerī Mutt. Monier Williams, however, calls it "an unreliable work" and regards it as "a fanciful account,"⁴ while Dr. Burnell thinks that "it certainly is not worthy of him"⁵ (i. e. Vidyā. Muni, to whom it is attributed).

1. *Myth*, p. 92 (Burnell quoted, middle), *JSMF*, p. 150 (and) *JSMF*, pp. 151, 153 (top para.s), Justice Telang's view quoted.

2. *Vide Truth*, p. 40.

3. *Vide Śri Śāṅ.ya* by Sri N. Rameśan, p. 8, Prof. Wilson's remark quoted.

4. *Vide his Sanskrit English Dictionary*, p. 1054, 1899.

5. *Śāṅ.ya and the Mutts etc.* by Śri K. Nilā., p. 70 (top).

(iii) *Vyāsācalīya* is regarded as nothing but *Mādhaviya* with some changes (हरफेर - Mr. Śarma).¹ It is, however, considered to be one of the sources of *Mād.ya* and Swami Tapasyānanda, an openly pro-*Mādhaviya* person, has also expressed a similar opinion.²

(iv) The opinions of scholars about the *Maṭhā*. texts, regarded by the Śrī. Mutt supporters as the authoritative source of Śaṅ.'s life, particularly in relation to the establishment of the Mutt, are also divided, even Court-Judges giving a ruling that they cannot be regarded or accepted as authoritative.³

(v) Even some of the authorities cited by the critics are not quite consistent in their own statements.

(a) Thus, Dr. C. P. Rāma. Iyer once says that "there is no such thing as Kāñcī Kāma. Piṭham"⁴ while in his *Report of the Hindu Religious Endowments Commission* (1960-62, p. 15) he says that "Śaṅ. established 4 Mutts for 4 disciples and Kāma. Mutt at Kāñcī for himself, where he himself became the head."⁵ Mr. K. P. Sunil says clearly that Dr. Rāma. Iyer is not consistent in his statements about the number of Mutts established by Śaṅkara. He is torn between his knowledge of history and Kāñcī Mutt propaganda.⁶

(b) Prof. B. Upadhyaya has discussed in his Hindi book on Śaṅ.'s life, the establishment of all the 5 Mutts by Śaṅ., including the one at Kāñcī. But, later on, he seems to have withdrawn his support to the Kāñcī Mutt, possibly due to the pressure of persons like Mr. Śarmā.⁷

1. *JSMV*, p. 251 (top).

2. Vide his *Śaṅ. Dig.* (Translation of Mād.'s *Ś. Ś. Jaya*, Introduction, pp. xii and xiii.

3. Vide *The Śrī. Maṭha* by Mr. B. Krishnan, p. 21. Mr. Krishnan also quotes from a book *Tradition of teachers : Śaṅ.ya and the Jagadgurus of today* by Mr. William Cenkener (Motilal Banarsidass, 1983-84) to the effect that "the ancient texts dealing with the institutions, called Maṭhāmāyās, date from the post-Śaṅ. period — they are inconclusive" (p. 109).

4. Vide *Disputed Lineage* by Mr. K. P. Sunil *Illustrated Weekly*, 13. 9. 87, p. 13.

5. Vide *Authentic heritage* by Mr. R. G. K., *Illustrated Weekly*, 22-11-87, pp. 44-45.

6. Vide *Much Ado about nothing* by Mr. K. P. Sunil, *Ills. Weekly*, 13.12.87, pp. 38, 39.

7. *Truth*, Foreword, pp. 1 to 4 and Preface pp. vii and viii.

(c) Dr. Sampurnananda has been quoted by Mr. Śarmā to have said (in 1956 A. D.) that "Śaṅ. passed away at Kedāranātha itself and that the Samādhi-structure should either be renovated or replaced by a new one"¹ while Mr. R. K. Iyer quotes him (Dr. Sampurnananda) as saying that "the structure shown at Kedāranātha is not a Samādhi but only a memorial."²

(d) Lastly, Prof. K. A. Nīla. Śāstry says that, in his earlier editions of his *History of South India*, he had said that Śaṅ. established 4 Mutts while in the recent edition, the person entrusted with the re-editing of the book changed the number of Mutts to 5. He is said to have explained to Mr. Śarmā and Mr. K. R. Venkaṭa, at a personal meeting in 1963 A. D. that he did not write a letter to them clearly stating his views about the Gaṇḍagopala Plate (Grant No. I) because "great pressure" was brought on him to write an ambiguous letter and he "succumbed to it."³

It may be noted that even in the 4th edition of Prof. Śāstry's book published in 1975 A. D., to which Prof. Śāstry has himself written the Preface, there is a clear statement that Śaṅ. founded a number of Mutts in different parts of India, the best known being those at Śaṅgerī, Dwārakā, Badarī, Puri and Kāñcī. The same statement is found in the 10th edition also, published in 1991 A. D.⁴ According to Mr. Śarmā, Prof. Śāstry told him in June 1963 that when he noticed the change from 4 to 5 mutts in his 'recent' edition, it was too late for him to make amends.⁵ The question is whether he could not make amends in the 1975-edition also, if he really felt that it was necessary to make his own position clear, or he was still under the same pressure as before. Or again, had he removed the name of the Kāñcī Mutt as per his talk with Mr. Śarmā in his 4th edition but that the name was introduced mischievously once again in 1991 - Edition without his knowledge and consent? He himself says in his own Preface

1. *JSMV*, p. 494.

2. *Truth*, p. 164.

M. K. R. Venkaṭa. has tried to comment on and reconcile the statement of Dr. Sampurnānanda. What exactly he wants to say is, however, not quite clear. He seems to have mixed up the physical and the mystical aspects of Śaṅ.'s passing away. We are concerned with the former and not the latter aspect and from that point of view, there is a clear variation between the two statements of the learned Doctor.

3. *Myth*, pp. 69-70.

4. *History of South India* by Prof. K. A. N. Śāstry p. 478.

5. *Myth*, p. 70 (top).

to that edition that "by and large, the text is the same as presented in the third edition" (1966 A. D.).

Moreover, Prof. Śāstry makes an exactly similar statement (that Śaṅ. established 5 mutts, one of them being at Kāñcī) in another book of his, viz. *Development of Religion in South India*, also published in 1963 A. D.¹ Was this statement also introduced by the editor without the consent or knowledge of the author and retained by the author under pressure? Again, how could the persons pressurising him come to know about Mr. Śarmā's letter or its contents, that they thought of exerting the pressure? On the contrary, it seems that Mr. Śarmā is trying to make Prof. Śāstry disown his own natural view in the matter — that Śaṅ. established 5 Mutts in all, one of them being one at Kāñcī for himself — and to make him say something against himself.

Mr. Śarmā refers to "letters received from Dr. C. P. Rāma. Iyer, Śrī K. M. Munshi, Śrī Śrīprakāśa and others as to how they were influenced and pressurised to say something which they did not want (to say)."² Without the text and context of these letters, we do not know whether they had any bearing on the present subject of Śaṅ.'s mutts and hence it is neither fair nor advisable to make any comments, relying only on what Mr. Śarmā says so vaguely.

On the other hand, persons like Śrī Anantānendra Saraswatī, Śrī A. Kuppaswamy have cited the opinions of equally eminent scholars like Pandit Gopinātha Kavirāja, MM. Ganganath Jha, Prof. Hiriyanna, Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan and others that Śaṅ. established 5 Mutts in all, one being at Kāñcī for his own residence during the last days of his life.³

My only object in dilating on this point to such an extent is to show that in this medley of opinions, which do not have the basis of the full material and hence a correct estimate thereof as also of the exact point at issue, it is not advisable to lay any emphasis on them and accept and rely upon the statements as so many quotable views or to come to any conclusion in the matter, one way or the other, however learned and eminent these great persons may otherwise be.

1. Vide, p. 85, of the book (by Prof. K. A. N. Sastry), 1963.

2. *Myth*, p. 70.

3. (i) *Śrī and Śrī. Śaṅ. Insti.* by Śrī A. Saras. pp. 131-133.

and (ii) *Śrī Śaṅ. Bhagavatpāddācārya*, by Śrī A. Kuppaswamy, pp. 111-115.

Conclusion

A number of persons say that Śaṅkarācārya established "several" mutts, five of them being principal and the Kāñcī mutt is said to be one of these five. Works like *G. V. K.* and *Bhg. Daya* also refer to five mutts, one of them being at Kāñcī, though these references have been attempted to be explained away. Out of all these several or rather 5 principal well-known mutts, exception has been taken to Kāñcī Kāma. Mutt only and a tussle exists between this mutt on one side and the Śringerī and the other three mutts on the other side. Actually, this tussle is between the K. K. Mutt and the Śringerī Mutt only, the Dwārakā and Puri mutts only joining hands with the Śrī. Mutt in denying the establishment of the K. K. Mutt by Śaṅkara.

The main contention of the Śrī. side people is that Śaṅkara established 4 Āmnāya Mutts only and that no fifth Āmnāya Mutt was established by him at Kāñcī. At the most, they are prepared to concede a residential (निवासी) mutt at Kāñcī. The main difficulty in the case of the Kāñcī mutt and its supporters is that some of them at least have spoilt their own case, than boosted it, by making some very untenable claims, like their Ācārya alone being जगद्गुरु and all other Ācāryas being गुरु only, or the Kāñcī mutt being a permanent superintending authority over the other 4 mutts, or their Mahāvākya being ॐ तत्सत् and so on. Secondly, they have not brought out even one of the many authorities or works upon which they rely and from which they quote from time to time. I have it on good authority that they have with them, even today, mss. of works like *Br. Ś. V.* of Cit. and *Pr. Ś. V.* of Ānanda. which, if brought to light, are likely to clinch the issue, one way or the other. H. H. Chandra. Saras., Paramācārya, had shown them—at least one of the two—at least to 3 persons, if not more but denied them to me.

The foregoing discussion will, however, have made it clear that the existence of a Śaṅ. Mutt, at least a residential one, at Kāñcī is almost irresistible even to the opponents of the same, whatever they may say otherwise and many of the arguments they advance against such a mutt are equally if not more applicable to their own case—that of the Śrī. Mutt. Thus, the very existence of a Śrī. Mutt on the bank of the Tuṅgā river, as having been established by Ādi Śaṅ. has been questioned and thus, is not beyond doubt. Even staunch advocates of that Mutt like Mr. Śarmā have admitted that it is only suggested in the *Mādhavīya*, one of their two main authorities. The establishment of the other three Āmnāya mutts is still more doubtful if non-mention in the *Ś. V.*s is any criterion. On the contrary, works like *G.*

V. K. and *Bhg. Daya*, which are openly pro-Śrīngerī seem to lay down clearly the establishment of a Mutt at Kāñcī by Śaṅ. for his own stay. *Br. Ś. V.* of Brahmananda Saraswati also mentions the establishment of such a Mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī, while Swāmi Sakhyānanda of Trichur clearly says that he had seen the work *Śaṅkarendra Vilāsa* by Vākpati Bhaṭṭa and that according to the same, Śaṅ. had established a Mutt at Kāñcī, of which Abhinava Śaṅkara was an Ācārya in the first half of the 9th cent. A. D.

The real main-stay of the Śrī. side (and the Śrī. Mutt also) is the *Maṭhāmnāyas*, which are said to have been written by Ādi Śaṅkara himself. It is true that none of them mentions Kāñcī Mutt even indirectly. It has however, been shown before that, there is considerable variation internally in the different *Maṭha*. texts and also that they do not appear to come from Ādi Śaṅ. They must have come much later, perhaps at the time of Vidyāraṇya, though there is no direct evidence to connect them with him, also. To my mind, the whole of this Āmnāya Mutt business is itself of a very late origin and does not belong to the time of either Śaṅ. or even the *Ś. V.s.*, none of which contains the slightest trace of the same. The idea of an Āmnāya Mutt seems to have been foreign to the mind of Ādi Śaṅkara or even the writers of the *Ś. V.s.* Śaṅkara just established Mutts at different places and hence, that there was no Āmnāya Mutt established by him at Kāñcī is not an argument against the validity or existence of such a Mutt.

Now if, as has been said by some scholars like Sir Subramania Ayyar, the author of *Bhūmika* to *शारीरक मीमांसा भाष्य*, Sir S. S. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstri and so on, Śaṅ. established "several" i. e. more than five mutts, the five being the principal ones,¹ to which Āmnāya did the remaining mutts belong and what were their महावाक्य, योग, तीर्थ, क्षेत्र, देव, शक्ति etc. and if they did not belong to any Āmnāya and hence did not have these particulars, were they of no consequence in spite of their being established by Ādi Śaṅ. himself? I firmly believe that there is very strong prima facie evidence to show that a residential Mutt at least must have been established by Śaṅ. for his own stay at Kāñcī during the last days of his life, which he must have decided to spend there only. It has been shown in a separate article (Vide F. Note 1) and also in the thesis proper that Śaṅ. must have passed away at Kāñcī, the exact place not being ascertainable today and that even the opponents might perhaps have conceded this probability, only if it were not to lead to a natural implication that he also established a Mutt for himself at the place. And, then, as pointed out in the main thesis, it is

1. *Śrī Śaṅ. and Śaṅ. Insti.*, by Sri A. Saras. pp. 131-133.

quite in the fitness of things that it came to be called the Guru-Maṭha while the other Maṭhas, where disciples started the lineage of Ācāryas, came to be called Śiṣya-Maṭhas. This very fact must have given the Kāñcī Mutt an edge over the other Mutts, only to be used or rather misused by at least some of the K. Mutt followers and supporters later without justification. Similarly, it is also possible that Śaṅ., who attached very great importance to Sureśvara, placed him in charge of his own successor and even more than this, asked him to supervise the working of the other mutts also established by himself (i. e. Śaṅ.) and that this also was later glorified by its followers and supporters into a permanent superintending authority for the Kāñcī mutt over the other Mutts of Śaṅkara.

As to evidence, literary evidence is comparatively very limited and whatever is available, has been set forth already.

The judicial evidence, cited already by me, and by Mr. K. Kuppuswamy and Mr. N. K. Reddiar, is, I think, quite enough to bear out the existence of a Śaṅ. Mutt not only at Kumbā. long before 1800 A. D. but also of one at Kāñcī, both in their own right and not as subordinate to any other mutt like the Śrīgerī Mutt.

Epigraphically also, I believe, the Copper-plates by themselves are more than sufficient to bear out the existence not merely of a Kāñcī Śaṅ. Mutt but a Kāñcī Śāradā Mutt also, at least from the 13th cent. A. D. if we take 1291 A. D. as the date of the first - Gaṇḍagopala - plate and from the 12th cent. A. D. if the date of the said plate is 1111 A. D., upto the 17th cent. A. D. The grants may not have been worded just as Mr. Śarmā or Mr. K. R. Venkata. would have liked them to be, but they clearly point to a Mutt at Kāñcī, belonging to Śaṅ. परमहंसपरि०, with the names of some of the Ācāryas also being given in some of them, though not necessarily as per the wishes of the critics.

Mr. Śarmā's examination, analysis and criticism in particular disclose, at least to my mind, an attitude of prejudice and a preconceived notion about the Kāñcī Śaṅ. Mutt rather than one of real search for the truth (सत्यान्वेषण). Thus, at one place he concedes that the first grant may be genuine and quotes another authority also to the same effect but complains that the signature has been interpolated later, while at another place, he dismisses this first and the 10th i. e. last grants as spurious. In the case of many grants, it seems that he cannot but accept them as genuine and then argues that they must be pertaining to a Śrīgerī Mutt branch only at Kāñcī, though neither he nor Mr. K. R. Venkaṭa cares to produce any evidence for it. According to Mr. Venkaṭa, it is there in Kāñcī from ancient times,

Whatever arguments he has advanced to support his theory have been shown to be untenable. It is really surprising that the (Tuṅgā) Śrī. Mutt, which itself has no epigraphical evidence of a regular mutt at Śrī. prior to 1346 A.D., should claim to have a branch at Kāñcī long before that. Secondly, for a Śrī. Śāradā Mutt branch at Kāñcī, the very plates which are otherwise sought to be shown as doubtful, become genuine and reliable.

All this duplicity of argument is indulged in because the one manifest and persevering motive behind it is not to get at the truth in an objective way but to disprove the validity and existence of the Kāñcī Śān. Mutt in some way or the other.

It is worth noting that even the earliest grants of Vijayanagara to Śrīgerī do not mention any Śān. by name or even Śrī. or the Maṭha. Mr. Kuppaswamy has pointed out that out of the 35 epigraphs of the Śrī. Jagir-stone (30) and copper (5) —, there is no mention of Śrī. or the Maṭha in the first 12, there is the mention of Śrī. only and the name of the then Swami or Ācārya in the remaining 12. There is the phrase शृङ्गेरीय श्रीमठ in Inscription No. 26 and the phrase ऋष्यशृङ्गेरीय श्रीमठ in No. 31 and so on. Similarly, as pointed out earlier, none of the three persons — Vidyātīrtha, Bhāratī Tīrtha and Vidyāranya — has anywhere been referred to as a Śāṅkarācārya or as the head of the Śrī. Maṭha. On the contrary, in Inscription Nos. 17 and 24, it has been clearly stated just before the name of the then Ācārya of the Maṭha as विचारण्यस्वामिगळ-अवरपरम्पराशिष्यरद.¹ In none of these inscriptions has the Maṭha been called Śāradā Maṭha but at two places at least, it has been called श्रीमठ of शृङ्गेरी or ऋष्यशृङ्गगिरि.

Lastly, it has been said already that even this much epigraphical evidence, as is found in the case of the Kāñcī Śān. Mutt, is not available in the case of the other three 'Āmnāya' mutts and yet no doubt about their being established by Śān. has been raised by any one, including the Śrī. Mutt. On the contrary, the Dwārakā Mutt Ācārya suggests that original authorities should be called for from the Kumbha. Mutt in support of the claims they were reported to be making.²

Even though, therefore, it cannot be said with perfect certainty, in the present state of our knowledge and the sources available to us, that Śān. did definitely establish a 5th Mutt at Kāñcī, over which he presided as its first Ācārya, it seems from the evidence adduced and the arguments put

1. *Śrī Śān. Bhagavāya* by Sri A. Kappu., p. 118, penultimate para.

2. *JSMV*, p. 563; *Myth*, p. 40. Both these books by Mr. Śarmā quote the same letter from Śrī Śān. Swāmī of the Govardhana Mutt.

forward by us in the preceding pages that the possibility of the establishment of such a Mutt – Āmnāya or not – far outweighs that of non-establishment of at least a residential maṭha at Kāñcī by Śaṅ. for his own stay there during the last days of his earthly career. Till such time, therefore as more clinching and convincing evidence becomes available, it is better to leave the controversy here only, viz. that a 5th Mutt by Śaṅ. at Kāñcī is more possibly a reality than a myth or even “ a pious myth ”.

